DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 200 SP 034 318

AUTHOR Stedman, Donald; And Others
TITLE Teacher Education Program Review, Part I.
INSTITUTION State Univ. System of Florida, Tallahassee.
REPORT NO BOR-90-5
PUB DATE Nov 92
NOTE 112p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accreditation (Institutions); *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Master Plans; Preservice Teacher Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Schools of Education; *State Standards; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Education Programs; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Florida; *State University System of Florida

ABSTRACT

This program review examined the Colleges of Education in six of Florida's nine State University System (SUS) universities. The review was designed to assess the strength and effectiveness of the colleges and their teacher preparation programs, to evaluate the extent to which the colleges were meeting the objectives of university-wide planning, and to develop recommendations and plans of action that would strengthen teacher education and the public schools of Florida. The review involved joint activities and materials of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the SUS of Florida, and the Florida Department of Education. Ten recommendations are made to the SUS, focusing on such areas as academic programs, teacher certification programs, master plan goals, and preparation for national accreditation. Institutional reports are then provided for the University of Florida, Florida State University, University of South Florida, Florida Atlantic University, University of Central Florida, and University of North Florida. The institutional reports provide general findings and recommendations, followed by descriptions and concerns in specific areas such as faculty, students, resources, governance, curriculum, and relationship to the world of practice. Appendices contain a curriculum vita for the lead consultant, administrative items, a 1989 progress report on master plan goals for teacher education, and a glossary. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW PART I

STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA

NOVEMBER, 1992

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Table of Contents

Lead and University Consultants iii

Introduction 1

Recommendations to the State University System 5

Institutional Reports 17

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA 19

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY 27

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA 33

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY 43

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA 51

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA 69

Appendices 83

A. Curriculum Vita: Donald John Steadman 85

B. Memorandum of Understanding: BOR, DOE, and NCATE 99

C. Memorandum, Master Plan Goals for Teacher Education 105

D. Glossary 117

LEAD AND UNIVERSITY CONSULTANTS

Lead Consultant

Dr. Donaid Stedman
University of North Carolina
at Chapel Hill

University Consultants

University of Florida
Dr. Martha R. Bagley
University of Wisconsin

Florida Atlantic University
Dr. J.T. Sandefur
Emporia State University

Florida State University
Dr. Juan N. Franco
New Mexico State University

University of Central Florida
Dr. A. Jerry Benson
James Madison University

University of South Florida
Dr. Barbara G. Burch
California State University, Fresno

University of North Florida
Dr. Nancy L. Zimpher
The Ohio State University

PREFACE

This program review represents the first tripartite review of Teacher Education programs in the United States. In an effort to reduce costs, site visits, and preparation of materials, joint activities were conducted and materials used by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, the State University System of Florida, and the Florida Department of Education. Six of the nine State University System universities were reviewed at the time of this document's printing. A second volume will follow once the remaining three State University System universities have undergone the joint review and accreditation process.

Introduction

In early 1990, the Commissioner of Education and the Chancellor of the State University System of Florida jointly initiated a comprehensive and collaborative review of Colleges of Education in the State University System (SUS). The purpose of the review was to assess the strength and effectiveness of the Colleges and their teacher preparation programs, to evaluate the extent to which the Colleges were meeting the objectives of university-wide planning, and to develop recommendations and plans of action that would strengthen teacher education and the public schools of Florida.

The review combined the process of state-mandated national accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the redesigned program approval procedures of the Florida Department of Education (DOE), and a special review procedure developed by staff and consultants of the Florida Board of Regents (BOR). The combination of information and the findings and recommendations from each of these three sources of review were used to arrive at institutional and system-wide observations and recommendations in this report.

The process is unique in the United States in that no other state has purposefully integrated its national, state, and university assessment procedures to derive estimates and plans for individual or sets of professional education units. It is an evolving process that should be useful in setting goals and objectives for teacher education in Florida. However, it will not reveal definitive comparisons between and among curricula or programs at the campus level for purposes of reducing or expanding financial or faculty resource investments.

University consultants, recommended by each University, were directly involved in on-site reviews with NCATE, DOE, and BOR evaluators, and provided summary reports and recommendations to the Lead Consultant engaged by the BOR in consultation with the SUS Council of Academic Vice Presidents. The Lead Consultant was scheduled to visit all programs under review but this plan did not prove feasible. On-site visits were conducted only at UNF, UCF, and UF. However, the Lead Consultant has visited all nine institutions for an extended period of time in connection with the 1985 Teacher Education Review and subsequent special assignments by the BOR as recently as 1991. Thus, for this report, NCATE, DOE, and BOR reports and self-studies from six institutions (all except FAMU,

UWF, and FIU) were used as sources of information. "Process guidelines" provided by BOR staff in March 1990 were adhered to as closely as possible.

The principal source of information, in addition to NCATE documents and local consultants, was a special "addendum" report submitted to the BOR by institutions following guidelines and procedures set out in an SUS memorandum dated August 16, 1990. Each addendum was reviewed by the Lead Consultant and each element of the five general categories of interest was rated as satisfactory, needs more work, or unsatisfactory. An analysis of these institutional ratings formed a basis for assessing the overall response of SUS Colleges of Education to the Master Plan, previous recommendations from the 1985 review, and other directives.

The 26 July 1989 memorandum from Commissioner Castor to the Regents (SUS Master Plan Goals for Teacher Education) provided a primary format for gathering information and forming recommendations (See Appendix C). The memorandum particularly provides strategies for shaping teacher education programs to prepare teachers in Florida for meeting the national standards being prepared by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. In a very real sense, the current collaborative review has its origins in the Castor memorandum. While the review is not yet complete, there is ample evidence to assess the current situation and make recommendations for taking the next steps toward state-wide improvement and strengthening of teacher education in Florida.

Sources of Information

1. Individual Institution Reports - 1985 Review
2. Education Program Review - SUS, July 1985
3. Master Plan - SUS 1988-93, July 28, 1988
4. Memorandum - Commissioner Castor to Board of Regents, Master Plan Goals for Teacher Education, July 28, 1989 (Appendix C)
5. BOR/NCATE/DOE Joint Teacher Education Program Review: 1990-91, Process Guidelines, March 12, 1990
6. Education Standards Commission Report - April 1990

7. BOR Teacher Education Program Review Schedule and Self-Study Format, August 16, 1990
8. Academic Program Inventory - SUS, October 1990
9. Letter - Chancellor Reed to Dr. Arthur Wise

   Memorandum of Understanding - NCATE/DOE/BOR, June 26, 1991 (Appendix B)
10. Florida DOE - Teacher Education Program Approval - Standards/Criteria
11. BOR Addenda - UF, UCF, UNF, FSU, USF, FAU
12. DOE Self-Studies - UF, UCF, UNF, FSU, USF, FAU
13. NCATE Self-Studies - UF, UCF, UNF, FSU, USF, FAU

Institutional Reports

BOR Addenda submitted by FSU, USF, UF, UNF, UCF, and FAU were reviewed by the Lead Consultant, and recommendations based on their analysis are included in Recommendation #9.

Reports were submitted to the Lead Consultant by University Consultants who participated in NCATE/DOE reviews at FSU, USF, UF, UNF, UCF, and FAU. These reports are included in the section following this introduction. These reports were reviewed by the Lead Consultant and recommendations based on their analysis are included in Recommendation #11.

Recommendations to the State University System

Recommendations are made with the following caveats:

1. While the collaborative review among NCATE, DOE, and BOR staff and consultants provided an efficient method of review and has produced a great deal of information, this review was limited by lack of access to final DOE reports and the inability to conduct on-site reviews at more than three of the nine campuses during 1990-92.
2. The picture of teacher education in Florida provided by the mass of information is frequently clouded by new legislative or agency action that changes policy or requirements; thus, setting new ground rules for institutions is a rather regular occurrence. Making timely and relevant recommendations in this context is difficult.
3. Much of the information gathered for many documents used in the review is now more than two years old. Consequently, some recommendations may be made in areas where new steps have been taken already, or where problems no longer exist. Given the reluctant nature of institutional change, this time lapse may not be a major problem but it should be considered.
4. This report is not an evaluation of SUS Colleges of Education. It is a report with recommendations directed toward strengthening and improving teacher preparation in Florida based on recent self-studies and reviews by local, state, and national agencies.

Recommendation #1: Academic Programs and Teacher Certification Programs

It is important to maintain a clear distinction between requirements for academic degree programs in Education that are the responsibility of the University, and requirements for teacher education (certification) programs that are prescribed by the Department of Education. Making the distinction is not for the purposes of "preserving turf" but to clearly define authority and responsibility lines for taking actions and making changes, and to assign accountability for outcomes. At all levels, there is still considerable lack of clarity regarding the distinctions between the two program inventories and the authority and responsibility for modifying them.

Academic Degree Programs:

1. Institutions are making much progress toward containing the semester-hour requirements of undergraduate degree programs in education and in non-education majors leading to certification, but much remains to be done. Undergraduate degree programs preparing entry-level teachers should be limited to 128 semester hours of study for "native" students, and the amount of work authorized for transfer of students from two- or four-year institutions should be limited to the equivalent of four semesters.
2. While a "cap" on education courses in undergraduate degree programs in education is not recommended, course work in education need not exceed 36 semester hours, including credit given for internships, practice, student teaching, or other "field placements."
3. While a double major in education and a related academic discipline is probably not feasible, a coherent course of study amounting to at least 18 semester hours in the same academic discipline should be required for all undergraduate education majors.
4. Greater efforts should be made to develop authentic working partnerships between Colleges of Education and local school systems, with the clinical preparation of prospective teachers conducted primarily in the public schools under the supervision of carefully selected and trained mentor teachers. There are excellent models for establishing such activities now operating in some SUS institutions. They should be replicated throughout the SUS.
5. The range and complexity of both academic program inventories and certification program inventories appear to exceed the resources and capacity of Colleges of Education at almost every institution. Each institution should be asked to trim its undergraduate program inventory to programs for which a clear demand for graduates can be documented.
6. At each SUS institution, steps should be taken to establish post-baccalaureate, mid-career teacher education programs (masters degree or certification-only programs) that are keyed exclusively on critical shortage areas. Programs should be jointly conducted by Colleges of Education and local school personnel. The nine programs should be networked and a coordination, quality assurance, and resource development unit should be established at one

of the SUS institutions to insure effective recruitment, instructional, and placement operations.

Recommendation #2: Master Plan Goals

The Master Plan Goals for Teacher Education posed in mid-1989 have received serious attention by SUS institutions and their Colleges of Education. NCATE Self-Studies and BOR Addenda submitted by Colleges of Education were reviewed with these six goals in mind; the progress reports of institutions since the initial statement of goals also were considered. The following recommendations pertain to these six goals:

1. **Timely completion of studies (four-year baccalaureate)**

   Reducing semester-hour requirements to within a 120-128 semester-hour range for four years of study for entry-level teachers is done relatively easily. Courses can be cut, collapsed, blended, deferred, and reduced in semester-hour-credit value. The more difficult and important task is to devise a sequenced course of professional study that bridges two-year and four-year institutions. And, the contribution of two-year institutions can exceed just "early field experiences." The quality and experience of faculty and the collaboration of a third party, local public schools, are the two essential elements for progress on this issue. At least six demonstration programs of at least five years duration are required to show how effective articulation can lead to adequate, even exemplary, entry-level teachers. The SUS should establish such a group of demonstration programs. They should not cost more than $75,000 per year each, and external (non-state) resources could be commanded to conduct this work. The effort would have national significance -- win or lose.

2. **Service to schools**

   It is unlikely that service to the schools will rank "on equal footing" soon with scholarly work and excellence in teaching as a basis for acquiring promotion, tenure, or increases in salary for faculty members in a university. Even so, there are non-monetary and monetary

incentives for College of Education faculty involvement in service to public schools. There are at least four:

a. Support for school-based research.

b. Release time from teaching to provide consultation and technical assistance to schools.

c. Requirements for certain College of Education faculty members to teach in the public schools to maintain certification and employment.

d. Overload, summer salary, and travel support remunerations to College of Education faculty for carefully planned and evaluated service to schools.

Each SUS institution should establish or assign a school services unit to "broker" the resources of the institution to help strengthen public schools in its region. The unit might be part of the College of Education or another unit on campus that might want to do the job.

Most Colleges of Education did not appear to be well organized, and arranged to provide volunteer or low cost service to local schools. There is the persistent concern in Colleges that service activities by faculty members do not convert into promotion and merit salary considerations for them. Both Colleges and Schools would benefit from a system-wide organizational approach that would provide some infrastructure support for Colleges to carry out improved service functions. Aside from the traditional in-service teacher education programs carried out through the Teacher Education Centers, there is a real need in local schools for technical assistance in the areas of program planning, program evaluation, special studies of organization, curriculum, instruction, transportation systems, student support services, and many other areas.

3. **Increasing the number of minority teachers**

Policies whereby a certain percentage of students may be admitted as exceptions to established standards in order to encourage and achieve minority enrollment are not sufficient to meet the demand for minority teachers. The strategy most likely to increase minority enrollment in Colleges of Education is a vigorous effort to identify minority

students in 6th and 7th grade in the public schools, move them to academic and college-bound programs, and provide access to scholarship supports to enter two-and four-year institutions as prospective teachers. A four-year forgiveness loan program at all nine SUS institutions and at two-year institutions articulated with SUS Colleges of Education would, within four years, initiate a significant stream of minority students moving toward and through teacher preparation programs.

4. **Directing teacher education enrollments to critical teacher shortage areas**

   Micromanaging teacher education program productivity to fit more nearly the number and distribution needs of critical shortage areas is extremely difficult. Four known methods include:

   a. Scholarship supports for specific specialty areas (math, science, special education) with required periods of "pay-back" teaching.
   b. "On-the-job" teacher training for personnel employed to fill openings in shortage areas.
   c. Alternative methods of providing instruction in critical areas--team teaching, cooperative learning.
   d. Technology applications (telecommunications and distant learning techniques) to low density student areas.

   All of these methods require collaboration among universities, schools, community colleges and the business or local agency community. The campus service units mentioned above should be assigned this task and the nine units in the SUS should be "networked" to address the problem.

5. **Curriculum reform in teacher education**

   It is the responsibility of the institutional leadership to see that Colleges of Education meet the standards and requirements of national and state agencies. If the curriculum is inappropriate and incomplete in terms of a demonstrable research data base, then programs should be discontinued or set aside until revised. The most effective single step that could

be taken to assure appropriate and updated teacher training would be to change state-level program approval procedures from their current accreditation format to a process whereby the teaching performance of graduates during their first three years of work was used to make judgments about the programs that produced them. This would require a state-wide effort involving schools and colleges, but the technology is basically in place to devise such a system. No state is doing this now.

6. **Campus leadership**

   Colleges of Education cannot be fully effective without the support and expectations of top leadership on campus and institutional trustees and members of the Board of Regents. Each institution should clearly state the preparation of teachers for the public schools as a priority in the institutional mission and demonstrate a special priority for campus-wide involvement in the assignment and distribution of resources. In times of severe resource limitations, it is difficult for institutional leadership to favor any one unit over another. However, as nearly as teacher education approximates a campus-wide operation, as with a university library, it should achieve a higher priority than most other professional preparation programs.

Recommendation #3: Community College Role in Teacher Education

There is general consensus that there is a role for the community college in the preparation of teachers. What is required is a clear strategy for (1) designating which community colleges are capable of participating, (2) "assigning" partnership arrangements among two-and four-year institutions in the SUS, and (3) specifying the requirements for course work in professional education, and its transfer status from two-year institutions. For example, the two or three principal "feeder" community colleges associated with each SUS College of Education should be identified and a formal partnership program developed between those two-and four-year institutions so as to constitute an interinstitutional teacher education program. If possible, a program of planning and start-up operational grants should be established (perhaps with local corporate or business support) to stimulate and support these teacher preparation clusters.

Recommendation #4: SUS Role in Teacher Education

While the statutory base for stronger program development and interinstitutional collaboration directives may not be available to the Regents, the Chancellor, and the Commissioner, there is a strong moral, traditional, and leadership basis for taking greater advantage of the SUS arrangements than is now being undertaken.

Building principally upon the strong triad of institutions in Gainesville, Tallahassee, and Tampa, an effort should be made more purposefully to design and guide the operations of a network of the nine Colleges of Education, without causing them any loss of autonomy or overly governing their individual programs. Maintaining a "free market" approach to stimulating change in emphasis and productivity will not work well, and the risk of more vigorous designation of missions and priorities must be taken. In short, if the goals set by the Commissioner and endorsed by the BOR are to be met, a more direct and managerial approach must be taken to establish the strategies and operations that will meet those goals.

Recommendation #5: Collaborative Review - NCATE/DOE/BOR Studies

The current collaborative reviews are a significant advance in accreditation, program approval, and institutional reviews at the university level. The process should be refined and continued as follows:

1. Schedule NCATE/DOE/BOR combined reviews at the mid-point, off cycle, with the decennial institutional reviews of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). That is, schedule reviews every ten years, but five years before each SACS visit.
2. Reduce the overlap between standards in the NCATE and DOE procedures.
3. Reduce the amount of information requested by BOR staff, and gather larger amounts of information now acquired through the BOR Addenda through regular and improved SUS reporting systems.
4. Add a component to assess community college programs and procedures related to teacher preparation activities.

Recommendation #6: Business/Education Connections

It is of interest that in the course of the reviews there was little indication that Colleges of Education had taken full advantage of the long-time and rapidly growing involvement of the business and corporate community in the public school reform movement. Florida's business community was early into education-economic growth issues but not one major corporate-supported project was evident in the teacher education improvement activities at SUS campuses. This opportunity should not be missed and efforts should be made by University Presidents and College Deans, working with local school and community leadership, to address this issue.

There are particular opportunities for assistance from business organizations and corporations in the areas of management training, technology applications, and instructional design, aside from sources of financial and community support for school-college partnerships and outreach programs.

University development and community relations offices and administrators should be fully apprised of the interest and involvement of business in educational reform and the opportunities for universities that lie in this area.

Recommendation #7: Response to Recommendations of the 1985 Review

The BOR Addenda of the six institutions reviewed indicate that the majority of recommendations made in the 1985 Review of Teacher Education Programs have been put into action. These reports are certifications by institutions and no attempt has been made to verify them or to suggest that they have not been accomplished. Given the time that has lapsed since the review, it would seem most prudent to consider them accepted and move on.

Recommendation #8: Analysis of Local Consultant Reports on NCATE/DOE Reviews

Local consultant reports summarize the findings of the NCATE and DOE reviews for each institution. Three principal recommendations flow from these reports:

1. Institutional and College long-range planning needs greater articulation. College of

Education long-range plans reflect generally inadequate linkage to University-wide planning and lack clear priorities that focus on expansion of needed programs and discontinuation of unproductive or weak programs.

2. Investment in faculty development is badly needed, particularly to update faculty members in the use of technology for instructional purposes and to better integrate part-time faculty into the operations of the College.
3. A better organized and more concerted effort needs to be mounted to help Colleges of Education seek external support for research, training, and service activities. Stronger ties should be established between University development programs and Colleges of Education. Consideration should be given to a SUS resource development activity that would focus on recruitment of prospective teachers, faculty development, research services to local schools, and local school leadership development programs for principals and assistant principals involving Schools of Education, Schools of Business, and Public Administration programs.

Recommendation #9: Preparation for National Accreditation

Preparation for NCATE review must be thorough, and serious attention must be given to preparing a concise, "low-density," and straightforward self-study report. Three essential features of the standards must be kept in mind during preparation and visits:

1. The teacher education program model used and described is the choice of the College of Education but (1) it must have a research data base; (2) it must be known and subscribed to by all concerned (faculty, administration, cooperating and supervising teachers, and collaborating schools leadership); and (3) the program must provide a coherent course of study for prospective teachers, beginning with the general studies program and carrying through professional studies, and the period of induction or beginning years of work as reflected in follow-up studies of graduates.
2. The review is a campus-wide assessment of teacher preparation program operations. The relationships between and among Colleges of Education, local schools and community

colleges, and all relevant units on campus must be well established and rational, i.e., there needs to be a reason and a plan for the relationships.

In preparing for NCATE team visits, Colleges of Education should take the following steps:

1. At least 120 days prior to the visit, hold orientation sessions on the self-study report and the review process with top campus administrators, Arts and Sciences and other relevant chairs and faculty, local principals and teachers, and with students in the College, especially those in their student-teaching period.
2. At least 60 days prior to the visit, arrange for a "mock visit" by at least three professionals who are NCATE Examiner qualified or who are members of units recently visited and reviewed by NCATE teams. The purpose of the "mock visit" should be to spot areas in need of strengthening and to alert and educate campus and community officials to the NCATE process.
3. At least 30 days prior to the visit, conduct combined faculty, staff, and student discussions of institutional response to NCATE standards in the self-study report, the philosophy and operations of the College of Education, and priorities for teacher education at the institution.

The NCATE process offers Colleges of Education a unique opportunity to clarify their activities, strengthen their ties, and look to their future in the context of the best current set of national professional standards.

Recommendation #10: Analysis of BOR Addenda

Each College of Education submitted a supplementary report to the BOR consisting of 43 information elements organized under five categories--program, students, faculty, governance and resources, and general information. An analysis suggests that program and student issues are of greatest concern. Faculty, governance and resources issues are of less concern, except for the need for recruiting and employing increased numbers of minority faculty members and addressing the general problem of declining resources confronting the institutions and the entire state. (Institutional analyses are included

in the section following this introduction.)

Program weaknesses suggest that institutions may still need assistance in down-sizing undergraduate degree program course requirements to fit into the 120-128 semester-hour guidelines.

Among weaknesses most frequently noted in the Student category are lack of cultural diversity in the student body, lack of active and effective recruitment of minority students, and lack of regular and periodic follow-up studies of graduates to inform program revisions.

Of particular concern among the various resource items is lack of adequate support for teaching assistants, internships, and other student financial supports, and incentives necessary to attract and maintain a high quality pool of prospective teachers.

In general areas, the overall coordination and support of recent graduates under the Beginning Teacher Program (BTP) seems spotty and inefficient. The program should be reviewed to attempt to identify ways in which Colleges of Education and local schools could cooperate more effectively to support beginning teachers.

The use of the BOR Addendum should continue, but the Addendum should be simplified and made more complementary to the NCATE and DOE processes. Its central goal should be to address the quality of the programs, their productivity, and the need for graduates in the various specialty areas. It may also assess the status of certain BOR policies and the extent to which they are being followed.

A variation on the current arrangement for BOR involvement in NCATE/DOE reviews would be to add two BOR consultant-representatives to the visiting team, one from Florida, one from outside the state.

INSTITUTIONAL REPORTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

General Findings and Recommendations

The NCATE review findings and recommendations were outstanding. Responses to the 1985 review recommendations have been effective and complete. In general, this is a College of Education of excellent quality located in a major university with state-wide impact. Programs and faculty are first-rate. All NCATE standards were considered met with only a scattering of weaknesses cited, principally in the cultural diversity and follow-up evaluations of graduates. Both areas should be addressed soon by College and University leadership.

The BOR addendum analysis was positive overall but several specific areas show room for improvement:

a. The University of Florida itself needs a strategic plan to enhance the development of a long-range plan in the College of Education.

b. There is little articulation in existence, or planned, with community college programs.

c. Much work remains to be done to bring undergraduate programs within the 128-130 semester hour range.

d. There are several programs with marginal enrollment and productivity and alternate admissions policies are not being widely used.

e. Graduate follow-up studies are weak and stronger links with the Arts and Sciences programs should be established.

f. Faculty salaries are very low compared with similar American Association of Universities (AAU) institutions. This is a serious problem.

g. Surprisingly little effort has been made to establish relationships with the business community.

h. Greater emphasis needs to be placed on outreach and community relations.

Introduction

The Florida Board of Regents, the Florida State Department of Education, and the Examiners team assigned to visit the University of Florida, Gainesville, was expanded to include state team members appointed by the Florida State Department of Education and observers from the Florida Board of Regents. The joint site visit occurred October 28-31, 1990. The expanded team's responsibility included making judgments as to whether the NCATE standards and the state's program standards were met.

Comments in this report are based on the Institutional Report, the BOR Addendum, and information collected and reviewed by the on-site team. As the NCATE standards and review process focus on the total professional education unit and not individual programs, most of the observations and comments that follow will refer to the College of Education as a unit.

Teacher Education Program Description

The College of Education is responsible for most of the teacher education programs at the University of Florida. Written program statements, goals and objectives, and review procedures are available, as well as the mission statement for the unit. While the mission statement of the unit is congruent with the University mission statement, there may be some difference in priorities of the three general goals of teaching, research, and service. This is not unusual as most teacher education units place a higher priority on teaching and service to the community while the university as a whole views research and productivity as the top priority.

The unit does have in place several ways in which faculty, students, and other education professionals are involved in providing input concerning curriculum requirements and assessment. However, the unit does not have a long-range strategic plan in place which guides the assessment and/or development of programs. Much of the planning seems to be a reflection of the mission statement of the College. This lack of long-range planning creates a sense of each department "doing its own thing" instead of working together for a common goal.

The elementary, special, and secondary teacher education program is called PROTEACH. This

program has evolved over the past several years through much study and research by task forces comprised of education faculty, university faculty from outside the College of Education, and representatives from the public schools and the Florida Department of Education. PROTEACH is an integrated, five-year teacher preparation program leading to initial certification and the master's degree. It is characterized by a broad general education, a foundational component, extensive field work, a strong clinical component, subject-specific teaching components, and substantial work in the subject areas. It was the consensus of the team that the PROTEACH model is an outstanding teacher education program.

The team visited several classes and found the teaching to be excellent. They observed a variety of instructional approaches, the integration of subject matter across disciplines, and utilization of current research theory and knowledge.

The College of Education seems to be very involved with the K-12 schools in the area. In-service programs, consulting requests, Beginning Teacher's Seminar, and cooperative field programs are evidence of this involvement.

There is some concern that the general education requirements for some of the teacher education programs are not as specific as they should be. Realizing that over half the education students take their general education coursework at a community college, requiring specific courses becomes difficult but not impossible. Accepting the university's distribution for general education does not necessarily provide a good general education for education students.

Concerns:

1) There is no long-range plan in place for the unit.
2) Not all teacher education programs are part of the PROTEACH program. Some affiliated programs are perceived as not receiving the attention or direction from the College of Education that the PROTEACH programs receive. This perception can sometimes be interpreted as "not as good" which is detrimental to all the programs.
3) The general education requirements need to be more specific for some of the teacher education programs.

Students

Education students at UF are talented, dedicated, and committed to teaching. The academic quality of the students has improved over the last several years due, in part, to the higher admission criteria for the PROTEACH program. The students have access to faculty advising and assistance and many excellent student services.

The unit has published admission policies and uses multiple criteria such as GPA, SAT and ACT scores, and other educational information for admission. Since the PROTEACH program has a graduate component, it is important to identify students who have the potential to be successful graduate students. Alternate admission policies exist to encourage individuals from under-represented groups, but the unit has not adequately utilized these policies especially for recruitment of minority students. Even though many affirmative action procedures are utilized in an attempt to recruit minority students, incentives, especially financial incentives other than loans, need to be available to assure successful recruitment of qualified minorities.

Graduates of the teacher preparation programs and their principals are surveyed in the first year following graduation. This evaluative information provides good feedback as to the success of the students and the programs. Graduates also take the Florida Teacher Certification Examination.

Concerns:

1) The number of minority students in the teacher education programs is minimal.

Faculty

The faculty of the College of Education are qualified, congenial, and dedicated to the students and programs. They are involved in teaching, research, and service and are very productive in their profession. Course syllabi indicate that the faculty are current with the latest research findings and are very knowledgeable in their field. They are actively involved in professional associations and provide many educational services at the local, state, and national level.

Even though the Unit vigorously recruits a diverse faculty and practices affirmative action

procedures, the results have been minimal. Much more needs to be done in this area.

Faculty development opportunities, including the University sabbatical program, are available and faculty are encouraged to participate. However, the Unit does not use a systematic, comprehensive plan for faculty development.

The faculty are regularly evaluated in terms of their contributions in teaching, research and service. These evaluative data are used in determining salary, promotion and tenure, and to improve faculty performance. Student evaluations are used to evaluate at least two courses each year for each faculty member. Some students indicated that the evaluation tended to evaluate the course more than the faculty member.

Work load assignments, except for student advising which was very uneven, take into account faculty involvement in teaching, scholarship, and services, including curriculum development, committee work, and other internal service responsibilities.

Concerns:

1) The unit needs more minority faculty and staff.
2) Student advising loads are uneven.
3) The unit needs to develop a comprehensive faculty development plan.

Governance/Resources

The leadership and governance system of the unit ensures that all professional education programs in the College of Education are organized and coordinated to allow the fulfillment of its mission. The unit effectively carries out its responsibility in establishing and implementing appropriate policies for governance, programs, admission and retention of education students, and faculty selection and development in professional education. While it is clear that the unit has responsibility and authority to organize and coordinate the PROTEACH program, it is not clear that the unit has the same responsibility and authority for the specialty area programs in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Health and Human Performance, Agriculture, and Fine Arts. Linkages with these units need to be

strengthened and a systematic plan needs to be developed that would assure the cooperative involvement of faculty in setting objectives, recommending requirements, and making policy decisions concerning all teacher education programs. As mentioned earlier, there is some speculation that the teacher education programs that are not a part of PROTEACH are viewed as being of lesser quality.

The teacher education programs at UF have strong clinical and field-based components which provide students with sequenced experiences to help them develop professional skills. Most sites are selected with care and assure a professional and rewarding experience; however, some sites seem to be selected primarily for convenience. Quality and frequency of professional supervision is generally good and the roles and responsibilities of field advisors and cooperating teachers are clearly delineated.

Institutional support for the unit is based on consistent and equitable criteria and has regularly increased during the past five years. However, there is a growing reliance on the acquisition of grants and other special funding for the development of program initiatives.

Physical and instructional facilities are ample, modern, readily accessible to individuals with disabilities, and are moderately well maintained. The institutional centers provide technological support and computer facilities exist in quantity and are accessible for student, staff, and faculty use.

The unit library collection is broad in scope, current, and is part of the inter-library loan system. Administrative, clerical, and technical staff are sufficient. There is little or no reliance on part-time faculty. Graduate assistants appear to have adequate training and supervision.

Concerns:

1) Linkages with the affiliated colleges need to be strengthened.

Summary

The College of Education at the University of Florida is well administered and has quality programs. The mission of the unit is clearly stated and articulated. Goals and objectives of the various programs are congruent with the mission and are designed to develop professionals in education that have the knowledge and competencies necessary for success in the profession. Faculty are qualified,

competent, and dedicated to the profession. Students are talented and committed to education. Primary strengths of the unit are the PROTEACH model and the quality of instruction provided by the faculty.

Primary weaknesses of the unit are the lack of long-range planning; lack of cultural diversity in faculty and students; and weak linkages with the other units on campus, especially those units that are involved in teacher education.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

General Findings and Recommendations

This College of Education should be considered to be in good health. A close review of the many written information sources provides ample evidence of a strong College operating in a strong University. It is a large and comprehensive teacher education program somewhat loosely connected, but it attracts and produces excellent students for a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs. A campus site visit was considered unnecessary since the NCATE review was so recently accomplished.

There appear to be two areas where close attention should be directed:

A. The weakness described by the 1990 NCATE report to FSU in the area of curriculum design should be noted. The institutional rejoinder appears to be thorough, but the combination of concern for the presence of adequate models for the different teacher education programs and the observation that the teacher education program generally is somewhat loosely arranged raise the question of how well integrated the College-wide teacher education program really is. If one adds the observation that there may be too many adjunct or part-time instructors, then there is room for concern about the integrity of the program.

B. Both NCATE and BOR addendum data suggest a persistent problem in recruiting minority students and faculty. This is a state-wide and national problem but institutions of the size and caliber of FSU should be able to do better. The alternate admissions policy appears to be underused.

A review of the BOR addendum indicates a very strong set of degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Most programs are operating within the four year, 128 semester-hour range. The articulation with nearby community colleges should be accelerated. Collaboration with local schools seems to be very active and effective. The responses to the 1985 BOR review appear to be on target and effective. Given the research orientation of FSU, the College should be encouraged to conduct more school-based research and to provide more research and evaluation services to local schools. This effort would require additional resources but would foster further the considerable relationships between the College and schools in the region and with FAMU.

As FSU prepares for its 1994 NCATE review, every effort should be made to develop a more coherent, research-based inventory of teacher education programs with strong linkages to local schools.

General Impressions

The Teacher Education Unit at Florida State University is a vibrant, dynamic unit characterized by strong leadership, excellent students, and very dedicated faculty. Concern for the students by both faculty and administrators is quite apparent.

Because of the large number of programs, the unit sees itself as "a 'federation' of programs, each of which has aspects in common but each of which also is specifically designed to meet the training needs of a professional population." This is an accurate description of the unit. This arrangement provides for effective functioning of the programs in the unit but, at the same time, makes it difficult for the unit to respond to some of the NCATE standards (e.g., Standard IA). This dilemma is addressed in more detail later in this report.

In general, the quality of the programs in the unit is very good. Nonetheless, as with all programs, there are some areas that could be improved. Strengths, areas of concern, and recommendations follow.

Strengths

The strengths of the teacher education unit are many. In this section, the strengths that are most apparent will be discussed.

1. **Quality of Graduates.** The quality of the unit's graduates is very high. This is evidenced by a variety of sources. The students do well in coursework field experiences and initial K-12 assignments. A very high rate of students do well in the Beginning Teacher Program. Further, an over 98 percent completion rate has been experienced by FSU students on the Florida Teacher Certification Examination.
2. **Student Teaching.** The student teaching experience is systematically planned, sequenced, and coordinated to provide the best opportunity for success. Feedback and assistance are provided on a regular basis by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.

3. **Follow-up Studies.** The unit utilizes various models for evaluation and follow-up of its graduates. Each program receives and reviews the data from the follow-up studies and evaluative feedback. According to the NCATE Board of Examiners, fifteen specialization areas have modified or improved their programs as a result of this effort.
4. **Assistance to Beginning Teachers.** The unit offers assistance to beginning teachers and to employers of beginning teachers. The faculty offers services to the public schools through the Teacher Education Center.
5. **Relationship with the Public Schools.** A laudable strength of the teacher education unit is its concerted effort to develop positive working relationships with public school educators and the community. The Teacher Education Center is a good example of this effort.
6. **Monitoring Student Progress.** The unit has an exemplary system of tracking student programs from the moment a student meets the admission criteria until the student exits the program.
7. **Caring Atmosphere.** One of the major strengths of the unit is the caring atmosphere perceived by the students. This perception was revealed over and over by the students who were interviewed during the BOE site visit.
8. **Assignment of Faculty Loads.** The faculty seem happy with the system used for computing work loads that includes teaching, research, and service. It appears that it allows sufficient differentiation in terms of faculty interests and expertise. There is ample opportunity for faculty to work with the public schools through varied work-load assignments including assignments to the teacher center.

Areas of Concern

1. **Design of the Curriculum.** The federated system has worked well for the unit. At the same time, this system has made it difficult for the unit to develop an overall model that "explicates the purposes, processes, outcomes, and evaluation of the program." Thus, most of the programs have developed a model specific to their own needs. There is a need

for the unit to develop and adopt some common broad philosophical statements that all programs can then follow in developing their own models. It appears, also, that some programs have not developed models which are evident in course materials.

2. **Diversity of Student Body.** The unit has not been successful in recruiting a large number of minority students. The Institutional Report states that 3.8 percent of the student enrollment is minority. The Institution Rejoinder states that 4.8 percent of the student are minority. Either number is low and additional efforts need to be taken to increase the diversity of the student body. Some efforts are being extended in this direction. The Ford Foundation Grant is helping, but what is needed is a more aggressive unit and institutional commitment. This may require the use of internal monies to establish additional strategies to recruit talented minority students. Stating that this is a national problem as a justification is akin to stating that we do not need to improve our education programs because this too is a national problem.
3. **Pre-student Teaching Experiences.** The NCATE Board of Examiners found that the pre-student teaching experiences were not systematically selected and sequenced and that the Director of Student Teaching had no control over pre-student teaching activities. However, since the visit, the Director of Student Teaching has been charged with the responsibility of coordinating and monitoring all clinical experiences. This concern may have been resolved.
4. **Faculty Recommendations.** Faculty recommendations should be part of the application process at the basic level. The institution states that the option is there, but it has not been the practice. Steps should be taken to ensure that faculty recommendations become part of the process.
5. **Supervision of Clinical Experiences.** The supervision of some clinical experiences exceeds the 18:1 ratio required by NCATE. Steps need to be taken to remedy this situation.
6. **Faculty Development.** It appears that funds for faculty development are limited. Specifically, support for sabbaticals and faculty travel is available on a limited basis. It appears that there is much competition for these funds.

7. **Culturally Diverse Faculty.** The composition of the faculty is not culturally diverse. Currently, 6.8 percent of the professional education faculty is minority. Efforts need to be undertaken to hire a more diverse faculty.
8. **Childhood Education.** The percentage of adjunct faculty is too high. According to one count, 80 percent of the load is assigned to non-regular faculty members. The limited access concept will probably help with this problem. The unit recognizes that this is a problem and appears willing to take steps to rectify it.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made in accordance with the strengths and weaknesses listed above:

1. The unit should continue developing an already fine teacher education program. The program produces top-notch graduates and should be encouraged to continue on that path.
2. The unit as a whole needs to continue developing a unit-wide model of teacher training which is broad enough that it still allows the various programs to develop their more specific models of training.
3. A more aggressive affirmative action program needs to be developed to attract a more diverse student population and faculty. It is recognized that the University is already putting some effort into resolving this problem. The results, however, are limited at this point. A comprehensive effort needs to be developed that begins identifying potential minority students in the public schools. Scholarships for minority students going into education would help recruit students. Some retention programs may need to be instituted to help ensure that minority students recruited to the program actually complete the program. For example, faculty-student mentoring programs have been very successful in the retention of students.

   Similarly, aggressive efforts need to be directed at recruiting a more diverse faculty. There are several recruitment models that have been successful at other institutions. The

unit might consider hiring a consultant to provide assistance in this regard.

4. Faculty recommendations need to be part of the application packet for students wishing to be admitted to the teacher education programs. This is a situation that can be easily resolved.
5. In a few cases the faculty/student ratio in the supervision of clinical experiences surpasses the NCATE requirement. The unit needs to take steps to address the problem. The solution could be in the form of additional resources or limiting enrollment in the programs in question.
6. Additional monies need to be made available for faculty development. Sabbaticals and faculty who travel for professional development have long been part of the professional experience. Efforts need to be undertaken to make these experiences more readily available to the faculty.

In general, the Teacher Education Program at Florida State University is an excellent one. Like all programs, it can do some things to improve. It is hoped that the weaknesses cited in this report are accepted as constructive criticism. It should be noted that the strengths of the program far outweigh the weaknesses.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

General Findings and Recommendations

This College of Education is in excellent health. The results of the NCATE review indicate that an exemplary program exists at USF with a strong faculty and comprehensive and effective relationships established with the public schools of the region. The College has responded effectively to the recommendations in the 1985 review, the College is responsive to SUS Master Plan requirements, and considerable success has been achieved in both student and faculty minority recruitment.

In general, a close review of NCATE findings, analysis of the BOR addendum, and the findings of the special consultant suggest that the College of Education at USF is in excellent shape. They should be commended not only for outstanding work but extraordinarily thorough reporting and preparation of information and materials to represent their teacher education programs.

Programs

The University of South Florida offers a number of outstanding programs at both the bachelor's, master's, and specialist degree levels. These include programs for the preparation of elementary and secondary school teachers at the bachelor's and master's level, as well as master's degrees in educational media, reading, and a number of areas in special education. A specialist degree is offered in school psychology.

Detailed and comprehensive curricular models are in place for all programs, with the knowledge base thoroughly documented for each program area and course. While more than one model exists, all include the Florida Performance Measurement System as part of the base. Specific objectives are based on the generic teaching competencies which are state-mandated and included in the Florida Administrative Code. The research base which supports these competencies is well documented. Realities of professional practice have been integrated throughout the curriculum and are correlated with the documented knowledge base.

It is apparent that the programs are focused on developing good teachers who are intellectually engaged, affectively positive, professionally excellent, and self-disciplined. Students are required to attain a high level of academic competency in their specialty studies teaching areas. These specialty studies are built on the recommendations of professional learned societies as well as on professional consensus reflected in state certification requirements and research findings. While the general education areas are well defined, the formally identified avenues for input and assured collaboration between faculty in the professional preparation unit and faculty who teach in the general education areas could be improved.

In all programs it is clear that particular attention is given to preparing students to meet the needs of exceptional children and children from diverse cultures. There is also in place a state-wide articulation agreement between Florida's public universities and community colleges by which all associate degree holders, upon acceptance to the University, are accepted as having met the general education requirements.

Faculty

Faculty members are well respected as proficient teachers by their peers outside of the Unit. This is evidenced by comments of colleagues and students, requests for consultations, and awards received for undergraduate teaching performance. Instructional quality is monitored through regular and required student evaluations, and efforts are made through several different approaches to assist faculty who need to improve their teaching effectiveness.

All faculty members are performing assignments in their areas of specialization. Almost all faculty have doctoral degrees; the few who do not are long-term employees with outstanding experience and do not teach advanced graduate courses. Faculty with doctorates were prepared at 44 different institutions which include good national representation. There is, however, limited diversity relative to racial and ethnic considerations, and only 7 percent of the faculty were non-white at the time of the NCATE review. All faculty who supervise school-based experiences have had K-12 school experience, and all use a prescribed and closely monitored supervision process. All cooperating teachers are

certified in the intern's major and are screened to ensure that they meet, and typically exceed, appropriate criteria.

Teaching accounts for approximately two-thirds of faculty time, grants for about 10 percent, and administration about 6-7 percent. Advising program development and service account for almost 20 percent of faculty loads. Increased enrollments and service requests, as well as need and opportunity for overload teaching assignments, sometimes result in loads beyond the nine hours recommended for graduate faculty. The growth occurring on the four regional campus sites also places an added drain on regular faculty resources. Faculty increasingly choose not to carry Teacher Center service activities as a part of regular load and prefer overload for this work. Only about 5 percent of faculty perform such service activities as a part of their regular load. Loads for serving on and chairing doctoral committees are particularly excessive in some areas.

There is adherence to the Board of Regents/United Faculty of Florida Collective Bargaining Agreement, which mandates performance evaluations annually on teaching effectiveness, contribution to discovery of new knowledge, development of new educational techniques, and other forms of creative activity and service. Student evaluations of faculty teaching are conducted and information is used to improve performance. A portion of the annual pay increment is reserved to reward meritorious performance.

Sabbatical leaves, reduced load development time, conference travel, tuition waivers, special training programs, short-term in-service leaves and tuition-free classes are available to faculty. Faculty upgrade their qualifications through service in teacher centers, as consultants, and through participation in professional organizations. Faculty productivity in teaching, research, and service is recognized among other colleagues on campus, and faculty records and acknowledgments are outstanding.

Part-of-load allowances, in lieu of teaching and research, have been used frequently to assist faculty to gain competence in desired areas. Travel funds have been made available to all who have requested them for state or national presentations. Tuition waivers are also available to cooperating teachers for use in professional development.

Students

A rapport has been achieved with graduates which is consistently reported by all interviewees as well as in follow-up studies. Graduates consider themselves living testimony of the quality of the Unit's programs. Regular evaluations are carried out, and graduates actively participate in follow-up studies which have been compiled by the Unit. There is strong evidence that results from follow-up studies have been used for redesigning many of the Unit's programs. Also, many graduates indicate they are able to contact the Unit and receive assistance following graduation, as needed. The responses from employers and graduates alike are quite positive regarding the quality of preparation provided by the Unit.

The recruitment of high caliber candidates for the Unit is encouraged through scholarships, recruitment visits, course work tailored to fit the needs of part-time students, and through special interest organizations. The Unit has proposed and operationalized a number of strategies to pursue in order to recruit and admit additional minorities. It has also given high priority to developing a task force to provide leadership for this initiative.

The teacher education degree and state licensure require that students must pass the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE), which assesses proficiency in teaching specialization, professional knowledge, and academic skills. Also, the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST), which includes assessment of communication and computation skills, is taken prior to entrance to the Unit. The quality of student advising is quite good and the advising program is comprehensively developed.

The new GPA requirement is 2.5 for both admission and graduation from the teacher education program. A minimum score of 17 on the ACT or 835 on the SAT is required for entering freshmen, with preference given to students with higher scores and to minorities if there are more applicants than the program can accommodate. Students must also meet, by the junior year, minimum scores on a Florida achievement test (CLAST). For students from diverse economic, racial, and cultural backgrounds who do not meet minimum requirements, the Unit may and does occasionally waive the required ACT or SAT score through the use of the University's ten percent exception rule.

Program requirements are published in the undergraduate catalog and College of Education Survival Manual for students. Individual checklists that provide systematic monitoring and reporting of completion of specified requirements are provided to students and departmental advisers at the end of each semester. One faculty member in each department is assigned the responsibility for advising students as a part of the teaching load. Program advising is available also from the Student Personnel Office on the main campus and the satellite campuses. Part-time personnel are employed also by the Student Personnel Office to provide advising to students at the beginning of each semester.

Students can secure special assistance in their studies through Project Thrust, a university-wide academic assistance program; the USF Special Services, an academic help program for low income and physically disabled students; and the Minority Organization of Students in Education, one of 19 organizations on campus for Black students.

Departmental faculty, central advising staff, and field supervisors regularly monitor course work, fieldwork, and requirements for graduation for students in basic programs. A computer print-out of grades, cumulative GPA, and other pertinent information is sent to students each semester. Student advising reports are monitored by the student's departmental adviser, and identified problems are discussed with the student. While these procedures are in place for monitoring student progress, the extent to which they are being utilized and systematically applied is uncertain and elusive, particularly for students admitted under alternative procedures.

The SCATT program (Suncoast Area Teacher Training) is a nationally recognized preservice honors program which is an effective recruiting tool for the College. A minority recruiter has been added recently to the SCATT staff. Graduate assistantships are available for both master's and doctoral students.

A Career Development Process (SLS 2401) course is offered for students desiring career planning help. There is also the University Experience (SLS 1101) orientation course provided for students. A Counseling Center for Human Development is provided, consistent with State mandate (Florida Administrative Code, Ch. 6C4-6.001-011), to provide various types of social and counseling services for students.

Relationship to the World of Practice

The unit has a large variety of programs which appear to be very effective in outreach to schools. The Unit's Teacher Education Center (TEC) annually receives more than $500,000 from the surrounding 17 counties to respond to their ongoing staff development needs. More than 17,000 TEC hours have been delivered by Unit's faculty in the past ten years, which exceeds that of any other institution in the State.

In several program areas, there is collaborative research involving faculty, practitioners, and sometimes advanced-level students. Some of these initiatives have resulted in jointly published articles, and several studies have effected change of school policy and/or procedures. The extent of faculty work with schools and the positive evaluations received indicate that this College has met the mandate of Chapter 6A-5 of the Florida Administrative Code, that teacher education units develop positive working relationships with the schools.

The field experience component for elementary education students is very thorough, with students being required to have three different internship assignments involving diverse populations. The secondary program is in the process of incorporating appropriate pre-internship components. The final internship experience required for all students is 15 weeks and includes planned seminars as well as other group activities. Bargaining agreements designed to ensure wide distribution of interns in certain districts at times limit the Unit's control over student assignments.

Resources and Governance

Most physical facilities are accessible to disabled students; where they are not, the physical facility plan for improvement calls for modifications. Office and classroom facilities are well maintained and functional.

Resources are used flexibly and are enhanced by more than $6 million in annual external funding. Several R and D Centers are in operation, assisting in the maintenance of a strong outreach program. A long-range plan exists for both the Unit and regional campuses, but it seems to be relatively

unmonitored. Library collections, including those of special importance to teacher education students, are adequate. Faculty actively participate in review of library materials for purchase.

Faculty loads have been previously addressed in this report. They tend to be heavy, principally as a result of in-service commitments. With the possible exception of clerical support, there is an adequate number of personnel at both levels.

Unit congruence with the university mission is evident in the USF Strategy Plan (1985-90) and College of Education Special Information Booklet. Both are outreach-focused, show heavy commitment to serve the community and to develop excellence in teaching, research, and service. There is also good representation of practitioners and students in various policy and advising bodies, with students appointed to different Unit-wide committees. Due process is assured to students, faculty, and staff.

The University of South Florida has a very strong program which has been well developed and which is positively supported by faculty and students alike. There are a number of very outstanding aspects of this professional preparation program which are listed below. They are followed by several suggestions for improvement of the program.

Outstanding Program Features

1. The program model is based on systematic and comprehensive analysis and includes exemplary integration among curricular elements, with a particularly thorough implementation design for the programs.
2. The three-tiered elementary education internship sequence is structured in an exemplary manner which assures that students grasp essential knowledge bases, develop high levels of confidence resulting from continued feedback and support, and utilize a systematic building block approach which prepares them to handle well an entire classroom experience.
3. A unique discrepancy approach is being applied to assess the perceived effectiveness of graduates, with the results being extensively used to influence significant and comprehensive redesign of programs.

4. There is a strong and positive Unit presence in the schools. A working relationship has been developed in which school personnel identify with the Unit's programs and serve as a major recruiting and marketing force for the Unit.
5. Recognition of faculty quality and productivity is especially evident through publications, consultancies, grants, research and development centers operating in the Unit, and through evidence of peer recognition, both within the institution and the nation.
6. Changing priorities are most effectively supported through creative identification and utilization of resources in a way that benefits the entire Unit. Structures are also in place that encourage faculty inclusion to accomplish the clearly presented Unit mission.
7. A unique preservice honors initiative, the SCATT (Suncoast Area Teacher Training) Program, has had a major impact on recruiting students into teaching and positively influencing the view of the quality of the Unit's preparation programs. Virtually every student, teacher, and school administrator views the Unit's program as exemplary. Future teachers and graduates of the program have developed a positive belief system in people, student potential, and the power to have a positive influence on society and its future. Graduates believe they can make a difference in the lives of their students and they serve as models of professionalism. There is a contagious spirit which has resulted in great support for and pride in teacher education among the Unit's constituencies.
8. The Unit has created a comprehensive self-study process that fully engages faculty, staff, students, and alumni. The process has become institutionalized so that it can be applied in ongoing operations.
9. The level of professionalism and commitment to the preparation of top quality school professionals at USF is very special and outstanding.

Suggestions for Improvement

1. More formally identified avenues should be developed for input and assured collaboration between faculty in the Unit and faculty who teach in the general education areas.

2. There is a need to continue identifying criteria that will assure a solid grounding in liberal arts for all students, and to suggest types of courses in various areas which will meet those criteria in the general education program.
3. The Unit needs to ensure appropriate control over student teaching assignments which are affected by bargaining agreements that give priority to wide distribution of interns in certain districts.
4. The secondary education program should provide more extensive pre-internship opportunities for clinical and field-based experiences.
5. Increasing enrollments on both the main and regional campuses, heavy service requests through the Teacher Centers, and expanding emphasis on research productivity are creating conflicting demands on regular faculty resources. A plan is needed to accommodate these needs without increasing use of faculty overloads or excessive use of adjunct faculty. This may require additional faculty positions.
6. Attention must be given to assuring appropriate faculty loads for individuals working with doctoral students in those areas where student numbers exceed the number of available faculty who are qualified to serve on doctoral committees.
7. The faculty needs to increase its representativeness of cultural diversity in terms of racial and ethnic groups, particularly considering the comprehensiveness, size, and location of the Unit and institution.
8. A more closely defined and regularized system is needed to coordinate and monitor work of adjunct faculty who, while seemingly well-qualified, are extensively employed both in number and in different locations.
9. The long-range plan which exists for both the Unit and regional campuses needs to be more clearly monitored.
10. The ratio of full-time equivalent internship students to full-time equivalent faculty members needs to be improved in order not to exceed 18:1.
11. The combined need for part-time faculty and faculty on overloads should be reviewed in

light of projected continued growth and available resources.

12. More adequate access to teaching equipment, especially overhead projectors, is needed in the College of Education classrooms. (While equipment may be obtained from the library, it is not in a convenient or readily accessible manner.)

FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

General Findings and Recommendations

This College of Education appears to be in fairly good health. Because of the recent NCATE review, no campus site visit was considered necessary. The result of that review and a review of BOR information and the special consultants report indicates that close attention should be paid to the secondary education program. The program appears to be weak and faculty resources are limited. The College should consider limiting its offerings at the secondary level to areas of high demand and consolidate its faculty resources in those areas.

The follow-up on recommendations in the 1985 BOR review seem complete and effective. However, the area of minority recruitment and student enrollment of minorities remains troublesome. FAU is positioned to attract more minority students than are enrolled and more effort and resources need to be expended to solve this problem.

Efforts have been made to establish regular and periodic reviews and follow-up studies of graduates, a weakness cited in the 1989 NCATE review. There is, as yet, little evidence of a faculty development plan.

The overall strength and vitality of the education degree programs is very good. Additional faculty and new leadership should strengthen the College further.

Category I - Knowledge Base

Design of Curriculum

The Teacher Education Unit of Florida Atlantic University developed a sophisticated knowledge base that was explicated in detail in the NCATE Institutional Report (IR). The knowledge base utilized the theme "The Teacher as Transmitter of Knowledge and Cultural Heritage." This theme was evident in the unit's mission statement, assumptions underlying the programs, and the goals and objectives undergirding each of the programs. Careful examination of the curriculum design provides ample evidence of the careful thought and faculty effort in developing the content. The stated goals and

objectives are supported by bibliographic references to the principal theorists and researchers of each area.

Attention was given to the Florida Performance Measurement System (FPMS) and the Florida Essential Generic Competencies (FEGC) in the development of the curricular design. The six domains of the FPMS and the 35 generic competencies of the FEGC were evident throughout the basic programs and contributed significantly to the NCATE Knowledge Base Standard. A FEGC/Course Matrix was presented in the NCATE Institutional Report that clearly identified the course(s) in which each generic competency was addressed.

The NCATE Evaluation Board listed "articulation across programs" as a weakness. The Evaluation Board's major concern was secondary programs which had no discrete description in the Institutional Report. Florida Atlantic contended that the described curricular design was generic across programs and applicable to all secondary programs. The Institutional Report listed secondary teaching fields on pages 136 to 157. Required and elective courses were specified along with admission and other departmental requirements. The information provided was adequate to allow the examiners to compare the objective/competencies listed in the generic description to the specific course requirements of each secondary academic program. Problems exist in the specific course requirements of each secondary academic program. Problems exist in the secondary certification programs that will be addressed under the Professional Studies section.

Delivery of Curriculum

Evidence exists that the teacher education programs have strength and currency, that they are broad and include traditional forms of scholarly inquiry, and that theory and professional practice are related. The NCATE Board of Examiners listed student criticism of some of their method courses as a weakness. Student criticism of courses is, in itself, a generic occurrence in higher education. The description of the delivery system explicated in the IR is traditional but also uses technology and individual and group instructional techniques effectively.

General Studies

No problems are evident in the content and planning of the general education component of the teacher education programs. Evidence of articulation with community colleges, specifically, Broward, Indian River, and Palm Beach County, was presented in the Addendum to the NCATE Report.

Content of Curriculum: Specialty Studies

The University has a well-planned specialty studies curriculum for each academic major. Elementary education programs require extensive preparation, 82 semester hours at the upper-division level. Secondary majors range from a minimum of 36 hours up to 72 semester hours. The courses appear to be well planned and appropriately sequenced. The Florida adopted competencies are addressed in the program and appropriate faculty are involved in planning, conducting, and maintaining the evaluation. Graduate programs require 36 semester hours of carefully sequenced courses for the degree in each area. Guidelines of specialty organizations are used. No particular strength or weaknesses are noted by this evaluator.

Content of the Curriculum: Professional Studies

The content of the curriculum in elementary education and exceptional student education is well conceptualized in the 32-hour professional studies core. The courses contained in the core represent a good balance of theory and practice.

The teacher education certification programs described in the Institutional Report do not represent the same degree of uniformity and control. In fact, the NCATE Board of Examiners found these secondary programs to be a weakness and recommended that the institution design a new core for secondary education that "fully addresses the seven compliance criteria related to Standard I.E."

The lack of uniformity in the secondary certification programs can no doubt be attributed to the past history of the programs. In 1984, the secondary certification programs were assigned to the specialty departments and were no longer in the control of the College of Education. Upon the insistence of a new education dean, these programs were returned to the College of Education in 1988.

Evidence points to a shortage of faculty in the methods area. For example, when courses were transferred to academic departments in 1984, faculty lines were transferred also. When the courses were returned, however, the faculty lines were not returned. It is recommended that at least four faculty lines be returned or added to the College of Education. These faculty positions should include expertise in social studies education, math and science education, and English/Foreign language education.

A second concern in the secondary certification areas is the fact that no course is required dealing with exceptionalities. Either a course or a portion of a course should be devoted to exceptionalities.

A third concern in the secondary certification programs is the fact that no field experiences are required in the methods courses. A one-credit hour field-based experience is required at both the elementary and secondary basic levels. This one-hour course is basically a general observation experience. It is recommended that relevant field experiences be included as a part of the methods course in secondary programs particularly. Elementary programs require a significant number of clock hours of field-based experiences in three different courses.

At the advanced level no graduate degree program is available in curriculum and instruction for secondary teachers. Certainly, the University has a responsibility to serve secondary teachers in this important area. It is recommended that the College of Education consider the need for an M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction.

Although the BOE noted other weaknesses in Standard I.E., the University satisfactorily rejoined the negative comments.

Category II - Relationship to the World of Practice

Clinical and Field-Based Experiences

There are no apparent weaknesses in the clinical and field-based experiences. Basic programs

require extensive experiences in a variety of settings. Advanced programs require practica in all programs and clinical/field-based experiences in most. The NCATE Action Letter cited clinical experience as a weakness in advanced programs. Review of relevant data and the NCATE report indicated adequate experience in all areas. Policies and procedures for selecting and evaluating field experience sites are in place and appropriate.

Relations with Graduates

The State of Florida requirements relative to program evaluation and assistance to first year graduates have been met. No weaknesses were cited in this area in the NCATE Action Letter. Furthermore, institutional documentation is adequate to assure compliance.

Relations with Schools

There is considerable evidence that relations between schools and Florida Atlantic University are excellent. There are several mechanisms that assure good relations, which include the Colleges Teacher Education Center (TEC) and the Institute for Research and Development in Teacher Education (IRDTE). Both of these formal structures, plus the many informed activities, assure faculty involvement with the public schools.

Category III - Students

Admission

Admissions standards at both the basic and advanced levels are good and meet NCATE and BOR requirements. Efforts are made to recruit underrepresented populations and special provisions are made for admission of students from minority groups.

Monitoring Progress

Monitoring progress is conducted effectively at both the basic and advanced levels.

Advisory Services

Advisement appears to be excellent. Completions of teacher education programs generally occur in the regular four-year period.

Completion of Program

Basic programs require the completion of standardized tests (e.g., the General Professional Education Examination), the Florida Performance Measurement System, a minimum required GPA, and other relevant criteria. Advanced programs require departmental qualifying examinations and successful completion of rigorous course requirements. No weaknesses were cited by NCATE.

Category IV - Faculty

Faculty Qualifications, Assignments, Work Load, and Evaluation

The NCATE Action Letter points to two weakness: (1) the lack of faculty cultural diversity and (2) the lack of a policy differentiating between undergraduate and graduate teaching loads. The University explains these weaknesses by reporting eight minority faculty, four Hispanic and four black, for a total percentage of 12.30. They agree that there is no written differentiation between graduate and undergraduate teaching loads, but they affirm that the typical undergraduate teaching load is three courses and the typical graduate load is two courses. In order to conform to NCATE Standards, a written policy should exist and documentation presented to assure conformance. Recommendation: a faculty load policy should be developed differentiating undergraduate and graduate faculty teaching loads.

The NCATE Board of Examiners found Standard IV.C., Faculty Development, to be unmet. Although there are numerous faculty development activities occurring, these activities appear to be irregular and uncoordinated as opposed to systematic and coordinated. Although much is being done, it would seem advantageous to prepare a document detailing faculty development plans over a three- to five-year period. Such a document would do much to assure a "systematic" plan. Recommendation: Develop a three- to five-year faculty development plan that will explicate the unit's efforts to keep the faculty aware of the latest developments and technologies in teacher education.

Category V - Governance and Resources

All NCATE and BOR standards appear met in a satisfactory manner.

Summary and Recommendations

There are many strengths in FAU's teacher education programs. Among these should be mentioned a well-conceptualized curriculum in elementary and special education at the basic level. The quality of students is very good, as is advisement. The faculty is strong and well-qualified. The Teacher Education Center and the Institute for Research and Development are highly commendable. University support for teacher education is evident through governance and resource provisions. One can conclude from available evidence that the teacher preparation programs satisfactorily meet both the NCATE and Board of Regents Standards.

As in all institutions, some improvements can be made. In an effort to identify these areas of possible weakness, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Responsibility for secondary programs has been returned to the College of Education. There appears to be a lack of faculty in specialized areas. It is recommended that at least four faculty lines be added to provide expertise in social studies education, math and science education, and English/foreign language education.
2. Secondary certification programs require no course or portion of a course dealing with exceptionalities. It is recommended that the College consider offering or requiring a course in teaching exceptional students. If a course is not feasible due to program length, it is recommended that a unit on exceptionalities be added to an existing course.
3. Secondary certification methods courses do not require field-based experiences. It is recommended that consideration be given to field experiences in secondary methods classes.
4. It is recommended that a faculty load policy differentiating undergraduate and graduate faculty teaching loads be put in place.
5. It is recommended that a faculty development plan be implemented that is systematic and

ensures faculty awareness and expertise in new developments and technologies in teacher education.

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

General Findings and Recommendations

This is a very good College of Education and it has enormous potential for further growth and development. NCATE reviews found all standards met except for the admissions standard. Both procedural and minority recruitment weaknesses were noted. Efforts have been made to address these problems.

The special consultant recommended that the use of part-time faculty be decreased to strengthen the integrity of the overall program. Also, it was recommended that field placement supervision be improved and more assistance be provided to beginning teachers. In general, the consultant found the College to be a sound and effective organization.

Responses to the 1985 review have been scattered. There is still only moderate articulation with community colleges in the area and there is no unit yet established to organize outreach and research activities.

Analysis of the BOR addendum suggests that alignment with the Master Plan is developing well enough. Plans are in place to keep undergraduate degree programs within the 128-130 semester-hour limit and there are few marginally enrolled programs.

In general, this College of Education is developing well. The enormous growth potential concurrent with the need to strengthen research activities place the faculty in a bind with competing pressures for both research and service productivity. Improved organization to deliver service to schools and to stimulate and conduct research would be beneficial.

New University-level leadership should help develop the great potential for relating the College of Education to the business and corporate community in the Orlando area. This would help further develop the educational leadership programs and research opportunities.

Teacher Education Program Description

Program Goals and Objectives

The primary mission presented by UCF is that the University provide educational, cultural, social, and research programs that complement a growing metropolitan region. The University seeks to serve its local and regional role while enhancing its national and international status. The mission of the institution and the programs offered appear to be responsive to central Florida's general population growth, and to its growth as a high-technology center, a cultural and international community, and trade center. Enrollment has increased significantly, there is a commitment to increase the number of resident students with an emphasis on cultural diversity, and program planning and implementation have reflected the needs of the region as well as cooperative planning by University administrators and community leaders.

The mission of the University and the mission presented by the College of Education reflect similar assumptions and goals. The program objectives and goals of the College, outlined in A Plan of Action for Decade III, appeared aligned with the stated University mission. The College of Education, as a whole, is viewed positively by and receives support from the University's administration. The administration depicts the College as fulfilling a mission of regional service while attempting to attain a national reputation. The College of Education Dean and faculty enjoy wide respect from colleagues throughout the University.

In relation to the SUS Master Plan, the number of new teachers prepared at UCF has increased by approximately 30 percent over the last four years. The College has been involved in a two-year self-study process in preparation for the combined NCATE/BOR/DOE review resulting in a critical review of and modifications to education programs. Other areas of the Master Plan are addressed in the remaining sections of this report.

Currency of Content

The Unit's curriculum design is strongly influenced by generic teaching competencies mandated by the state and assessed in beginning teachers through a standardized examination. In describing a

"Best Practices" model, the Unit seeks to integrate these 27 competencies (and 118 performance criteria) with its own tradition of experience-based curriculum design and to describe an overall spiraled pattern of knowledge, skills, practice, and feedback as the undergirding structure which guides curriculum.

While the mission statements of the University and the Unit speak to the spirit of this "Best Practices" model with references to the strength of the relationship between theory and practice in the Unit's design, there was no consistent evidence available to suggest that the Unit's curriculum decisions are systematically guided by a cohesive design that combines knowledge, research, and practice.

At the graduate level, there was even less evidence that a unit-wide model existed since most verbal and written references were program-specific rather than unit-based. A special committee is currently reviewing the master's level degrees, and discussions about a unit-wide approach (e.g., model and/or underlying knowledge base) may be an outgrowth of those deliberations.

The content of the specialty studies is a well-planned sequence of courses. A review of program folios and discussions with chairpersons and faculty showed that the academic, methodological, and clinical experiences were adequate and appropriate. In the biology, math, and science programs, it was noted that there was a strong clinical component which required students to become involved in simulation and observation as early as the sophomore year. Program folios further indicated that guidelines of learned societies had been used in program development and modifications.

Although the sequence of courses and experiences is well-planned and responsive to state-mandated competencies, interviews with students, recent graduates, and colleagues from the world of practice (NK-12) reflected unevenness between the skills and roles being taught by the basic programs and the skills and roles deemed necessary in the professional roles within the schools. For example, many ideas such as teacher empowerment, site-based management, understanding and dealing with the complexities of today's NK-12 student, and cutting-edge techniques seem to go from the surrounding school districts to the Unit rather than vice versa or collaboratively. Coverage of multicultural and global perspectives through the professional education course sequence and field experiences was not consistent at either the basic or advanced level.

Data presented indicate that all but one of the teacher education programs, Music, fall within the 120-130 total semester credit hours criterion of the SUS. The minimum program requirements in Music vary from 134 to 139 hours. Although the total minimum hour requirement does not exceed 130, the following programs have minimum program requirements that allow for no electives: Foreign Languages, Physical Education, and Business Education. No plan to adjust the minimum required credit hours for the specified teacher education programs was evident.

As 80 percent of the undergraduate teacher education students are AA degree transfer students, articulation agreements and student program planning are necessary in providing a coordinated program within the credit hour guidelines. It was not evident that modifications to program course requirements consistently took into consideration AA requirements or input from participating community colleges.

It was observed that the University Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) specified courses that must be completed beyond the AA degree articulated agreement for successful completion of the teacher education program. While the courses and supporting rationale were grounded in sound practices of training effective teachers, the overall effect may be to increase the required graduation hours for teacher education students and potentially increase the number of semesters needed to complete the degree.

The TEAC was found to be an effective means of sharing information and receiving input from other units and offices within the institution. Involvement of community representatives was evidenced on the College Advisory Council. Input from school district personnel is solicited primarily through participation on the Advisory Committees established by individual programs. The effective utilization of such advisory groups across all programs of the Unit appeared inconsistent. While classroom teachers were often listed as members of such advisory groups, their actual involvement was neither systematic nor pervasive.

Practicum/Field Experience

There is a major emphasis within the unit for students in the basic programs to have well-

sequenced, ongoing, and ever-expanding field-based experiences. These experiences occur at three stages. Initially students participate in observations and tutoring experiences. A junior-level field experience comes next in which they spend the equivalent of two full days per week during an entire semester evaluating student work, tutoring, performing clerical work, and using educational media to plan and present lessons of short duration. The student's field experiences culminate in a senior-year student-teaching assignment. The Unit outlines a semester-long placement in which it suggests that students spend their first five weeks of the fourteen-week program working gradually toward assuming a half-day teaching load. During weeks six through eleven the suggested program outlines the gradual assumption of teaching duties from half-time to full-time. Beginning in the eleventh week the suggested program describes the gradual return of classes to the supervising teacher at proper breaks in pupil programs. A wide variance in the amount of time individual students were engaged in full-time assumption of an actual teaching load, ranging from a low of 5-6 weeks to a high of 12-15 weeks, was evidenced. Students commonly experienced 8-9 weeks of full-time teaching.

School sites are selected with culturally diverse populations being an important criterion. Students are placed in several schools in order to increase the probability that they will gain experience with these populations; however, each student's cumulative assignments are not monitored to assure that each receives this experience, though a majority appeared to have done so.

Documents and training are provided to the college supervisor, field-based supervisor, and the student on the roles and expectations for each. All field-based supervisors met specified requirements and guidelines of learned societies. Discussions among the three participants are held regularly throughout the semester, usually at biweekly intervals. College supervisors provide support to the field-based supervisory teacher in increasing her/his supervising effectiveness. This ongoing, consistent partnership was identified by many school- and district-based administrators and teachers as a major contributing factor in the outstanding relationship that exists between the Unit and the schools/school districts.

Prior to the actual placement of student teachers on site, a document is signed by the unit and school officials; however, there were no written negotiated agreements between the unit and school

districts outlining the roles and responsibilities of the parties. Informal agreements appeared to underlie these arrangements.

The discussion in the previous paragraphs applies to the graduate level as it relates to strong relationships with the schools, culturally-diverse settings and placements, and formal written agreements. At the graduate level, however, the clinical experiences, especially in the subject matter areas, were often at the site where a student was currently employed and, in some instances, the student was permitted to select her/his own site-based supervisor. Insufficient evidence existed that the unit ensured systematic, rigorous oversight of these arrangements or that the clinical assignment/project/activity provided a sufficient "stretch" for the student from her/his current assignment.

Advisement of students and supervision of field-based experiences did not appear to be respected faculty responsibilities as reflected in the lack of a formal and consistent system of assigning advisors to students and the lack of weight such responsibilities carry in the merit, promotion, and tenure processes.

Integration with Other Programs

The University's Teacher Education Advisory Council appears to serve as an effective mechanism for both sharing information regarding teacher education and receiving input on teacher education programs from representatives of the larger University academic community. It was observed that this body takes action on policy issues. If this function continues as a responsibility of this body, it may prove to be inhibitory to a true advisory, innovation-oriented capacity.

Community College Articulation

Eighty percent of the undergraduate teacher education students are AA degree transfer students. In building a sound linkage among the General Education, Professional Education, and Specialty Studies of any specific teacher education program, the UCF-community college articulation agreements become significant. The advisement system for potential teacher education majors at community colleges appeared effective. While the TEAC serves as a vehicle for cooperative planning of teacher education

programs and for the interface of teacher education and general education, this process involves the representatives of the general education faculty covering only 20 percent of the student population, i.e., UCF general education programs only.

New Program Development

The proposal of a new B.S. degree program in Early Childhood Education appears supported by national trends and state needs. Existing programs at the graduate level should be thoroughly reviewed and necessary modifications made prior to new program development.

Students

Demand

The enrollment in teacher education programs has increased by 57 percent over the 1985-1989 period. No data are available concerning students who applied for admission, only for those admitted. Thus, comparisons of number of students and characteristics is not possible.

Enrollment data presented by individual teacher education program areas indicate that the following programs show declining enrollments over the past five years: Education Media, Music Education, Foreign Language Education, and Technical/ Vocational Education. Art Education demonstrates a similar drop but the degree program was "frozen" while under review for 1987-88 and 1988-89 academic years. These programs also all show 1988-89 graduation rates of five students or less. The College will need to address the need for such programs in relation to resources required to maintain the program in making decisions regarding the future of the programs.

Admissions

The Unit's admission policy which governs all programs is listed in official College publications. A review of the specific requirements for undergraduate admissions showed that the primary criteria for admission were performance on standardized tests (ACT, SAT, CLAST), GPA (2.5), and course grade (at least a "C"). Interviews and other criteria were used at the department's discretion.

Source

Data provided by the College indicate the greatest majority of teacher education students are Florida residents and enter with an AA degree.

Retention/Monitoring Progress

Student progress is monitored by the Unit at the time of admission to junior and senior year student teaching and, if students are placed on probation, by the University. These checkpoints and procedures are clearly outlined in the procedures of the Unit and materials provided students, e.g., The Notebook: A Guide for Undergraduate Students in the College of Education. During field-based experiences, progress is monitored jointly by the University faculty and cooperating teachers.

Students' records are maintained at the institution and in a state-wide database, the Student Academic Support System (SASS), and students receive an updated audit of their progress to use in consulting with advisors. There is no requirement for students to see advisors on a regular basis; hence, faculty may not be aware of academic problems prior to students being placed on probation.

Once academic problems are picked up, faculty do seem to be aware of the support systems to help. These systems are published in University publications, including the UCF Bulletin and the COE Notebook. Basic skills remediation is offered through the nearest community college and tutoring and other activities are offered through the Student Academic Resource Center.

The monitoring system at the advanced level consists of assignment of the student in a close, mentoring-type relationship with an advisor, regular reviews of GPA, and the use of written comprehensive examinations.

Students receive information about teacher education programs at UCF during their freshman year at the University or at the community colleges. Available materials include brochures from the College of Education, as well as the UCF undergraduate catalog. Admission requirements for the teacher education and specialization areas are clearly delineated.

Student due-process procedures are cited in the University publication, Golden Rule. The

process for grade appeals is specified by the Florida Administrative Code and is outlined in the Catalogs.

Although faculty are assigned advisement responsibilities, the system appears to be passive rather than active. Students must seek out their advisors and often are sought out by their advisors only when they are about to be put on probation. The emphasis appears to more informal than formal.

Feedback from Graduates

Since 1982, the Unit has received data on its beginning teachers' performance on the Florida Teacher Certification Examination and the Florida Beginning Teacher Program. In addition, while not part of a systematic plan, graduates from the Unit have been surveyed in 1984, 1986, and 1988.

Plans are in place for an annual survey to be taken in April of each year. Faculty interviewed indicated that results of the three most recent surveys were considered in plans to modify courses in foundations and media skills.

Cultural Diversity

Numerous scholarships, awards, mentoring programs, and work-study activities were listed as incentives to attract minorities. The awards cited most frequently were the "Chappy" James Most Promising Teacher Scholarship and the Paul Douglas Scholarship. Data did indicate that the Critical Teacher Shortage scholarships were used extensively. However, there was little evidence to show that the more than twenty other potential scholarships identified had been awarded. It was suggested that quite often students were not informed of the availability of the incentives. An examination of data indicated that the 10 Percent Rule had not been applied consistently to candidates from diverse populations. Data in the Board of Regent's Report showed, for example, that six exceptions were made in 1986-87 and three were made in 1988-89. None of these exceptions were for minorities.

Numerous references were made to the Ford Foundation proposal for recruitment. However, that program will not become operational until Fall 1990. It seemed that resources and programs

presently available were not being used to their fullest extent to recruit students from a diverse population. There is a task force on minority recruitment which has published guidelines. Mentors have been assigned for students as a part of that effort. Specific concern was given to the lack of use of biographical data and interviews as components of the admission process.

The University and the Orange County Public Schools, through the cooperative Minority Teacher Recruitment Task Force, have recently put in place a program to identify minority personnel currently employed by Orange County Public Schools who may have potential as future teachers and help them enroll and secure funding to pursue this career path.

As the majority of teacher education students are community college transfers, minority recruitment may be constrained by the cultural diversity of the community college. However, data suggest that minority recruitment potential exists at the community college level beyond the College's current level of activity. For example, The Chronicle of Higher Education (April 11, 1990) reports UCF with a 3.8 percent Black and 86.6 percent White student composition while Valencia Community College, the primary source of transfer students, has a 7.1 percent Black and 80.8 percent White composition.

The ethnic/racial breakdown for the advanced programs shows even fewer minority students, proportionally, than the undergraduate program. No specific recruitment activities for minorities were noted. A comprehensive system of admissions' criteria was in place (including the GRE, GPA, and recommendations) and is monitored by the Graduate Dean's office and individual programs.

Faculty

Qualifications and Cultural Diversity

The full-time COE faculty are well-qualified, holding terminal degrees from a variety of institutions of higher education. The COE is attempting to increase the cultural diversity of its staff, and recent hires reflect a commitment to this effort (of 20 new hires over the past year, 4 were minorities). The rapid growth in student enrollment has led to the use of more adjunct faculty (approximately one-third of the courses are taught by part-time faculty), many of whom do not have terminal degrees.

These newer faculty, however, do have fairly recent classroom experience, which most veteran faculty lack.

Faculty Load

The Unit's commitment to teaching is apparent. The Unit also emphasizes service and research. The commitment to service is very evident. However, many faculty members do not appear to consider research as an integral part of their profession, particularly at the undergraduate level.

The Unit makes provisions for faculty to teach, conduct scholarly activity and engage in service. An examination of activity sheets and schedules shows that generally a 9-semester-hour load for graduate faculty and 12-hour load for undergraduate faculty is the rule. Teaching loads are reduced for service and research at the discretion of the department chairperson. A review of full faculty vita indicates that the faculty is heavily involved in school-related activities, including in-service activities and service on various boards, curriculum revisions, and research both externally funded and not funded.

Faculty Development

The Unit's members engage in a variety of professional development activities and opportunities as evidenced by the documents reviewed and by a study of the "extended" vita provided. The number of meetings of professional associations attended and the level of participation in these associations is extensive. Involvement in public school service tasks, such as research and conducting staff development opportunities for local school divisions, has exceeded 2000 hours this current year. However, professional development does not receive unit-wide focus and direction, and results in individually-initiated professional development efforts which may or may not address areas useful to the Unit as a whole. There appear to be various funding sources that can be tapped to support faculty development if so desired.

Evaluation of Faculty

Records verified that student evaluations are systematically collected for faculty. Interviews with

faculty and administrators verified that a clearly understood process for regular collection and review of faculty documents (related to teaching and research) exists. Faculty members described their annual meetings with department chairs as contributing to their growth and planning; student evaluation data are systematically collected and made available to faculty; the college's annual report form provides for categorization and enumeration of all activities. While data on faculty service contributions are collected (names of advisees, names of interns and student teachers, lists of in-service workshops, and school-related service activities), no systematic evaluation of these activities is in place and there is little evidence to suggest that even an informal process is used for the purpose of improving faculty performance in these activities.

Governance and Resources

Library and Equipment

An aggressive, systematic review of library holdings has been conducted by the Education Librarian and retrospective purchases have occurred to fill out the collection. A special $51,000 allocation has been made to purchase material for the education collection. An extraordinary partnership exists between the library and the College's library committee. A Collection Development Policy was implemented in 1989 to ensure systematic review of the collection. The policy ensures input by Unit faculty. Faculty and students reported on the high use and strong support they received from the Learning Resource Center. Supplies are adequate.

Of the total number of 773 three-hour course sections taught in Fall semester, 1989, approximately 28 percent, both on and off campus, were taught by adjuncts. Approximately 13 percent, principally at off-campus sites, were taught by faculty as paid overloads. Thus, approximately 41 percent of the sections were taught outside of the regularly assigned load of full-time faculty. Given the Unit's expressed commitment to teaching and to public school service and the emerging research mission, particularly in reference to advanced degree programs, there are not a sufficient number of full-time faculty to support all of the programs offered by the Unit to prevent fragmentation of instruction and the erosion of quality. While the faculty would like to see the addition of more full-time faculty

lines, their selection and monitoring of adjuncts necessitated by the current situation usually exhibits prudence. Adjunct faculty are selected based on significant practical experience and are viewed as contributors to the College philosophy of bringing the realities of practice into the classroom. Each of the two doctoral programs (Curriculum/Instruction has at least 7 faculty; Administration/Supervision has at least 8 faculty) is adequately staffed. Supervision of practicum experiences is assigned at a ratio of 7 practicum students for each 3-hour faculty load thereby producing a ratio of 21:1 for full-time faculty assignments. This exceeds the 18:1 ratio specified by NCATE. Financial support for faculty development is present at levels at least equal to other units in the institution, with an average of $500 provided each faculty member for travel. Though clerical support has not increased at the same rate as faculty and student enrollment increases, faculty reported satisfaction with the services provided, and the ratio of clerical staff to faculty and administrators is 1:3.25.

While a program for monitoring adjunct faculty was described, it was not found to be functional across all programs. Information regarding personnel resources and policies governing field experiences may be found in section I.C. of this report.

Physical Resources

The facilities for the College of Education are functional, attractive, handicapped accessible, modern, and well-maintained. With the significant increase in student enrollment and faculty expansion, classroom space and office space are no longer sufficient. Computer labs and computer availability for faculty exist. A long-range building plan exists for the institution; however, expansion of the Unit's facilities was not noted for the immediate future.

Business/Community Specialized Relationships

The Unit has initiated such relationships with many facets of the surrounding community, e.g., Walt Disney World, IBM, Vocational Education associations and centers, and so on. Further development of such relationships would be consistent with the expanding business economy of the metropolitan area.

Program Management

The Unit has a well-defined and effectively utilized committee-oriented system of governance. The policies and procedures are clearly outlined in the College of Education Operating Policies and Procedures document. The emphasis on decision-making at the faculty-committee level was found in reviews of committee minutes, and documentation that such decisions lead to modifications within the Unit were noted.

Funding has increased over each of the past five years. This increase has provided 22 additional staff since 1985, $24,645 more for general expenses, and $66,800 more for equipment. Sponsored research dollars have gone from $663,066 in 1985 to $3,700,000 in 1990. Funding for classroom and office space expansion has not been approved and is needed. Budget allocations for the purchase of curriculum materials for the Learning Resource Center are so limited that most acquisitions rely on gifts from professors or donations from publishers.

General

Program Evaluation

Appropriate committees and channels are in place to accomplish regular reviews of the programs. During the past two years this process has been magnified due to the joint accreditation visit.

Progress on Previous Program Review

Efforts to attract minority students and faculty have been initiated while the results indicate more effort in this area is warranted. Multicultural components have been integrated into the theoretical level of professional education curriculum and to some extent, although not uniformly, at the practice level.

The Teacher Education Advisory Committee and various program advisory committees encourage the participation of colleagues from throughout the University in decision making regarding the professional education curriculum. As noted previously, involvement of colleagues representing the community colleges is limited.

Progress has been made on strengthening the doctoral programs in education. The research component still appears to be weak and is left to adjunct personnel as primary instructors. Faculty involvement in research was not evident uniformly across the Unit.

Assistance to Area School Districts

The Unit has developed a number of formal mechanisms to foster the systematic, ongoing interaction between its students and faculty and the personnel in the schools: (1) Teacher Education Centers -- specifically designed sites for student-teacher placement and for school-based in-service activities -- illustrate the collaboration in placement and evaluation of UCF students as well as in the identification and delivery of education programs for practicing professionals. Reviews of faculty vitae and Center records indicate a consistent pattern of service program delivery by UCF faculty and an equally consistent pattern of school participation. (2) Ongoing advisory committees and task forces are used in the majority of program areas, and committee documents and interviews with committee participants provide evidence of the use of these as more than just public relations vehicles. (3) The Institute for Professional Development - a newly formed collaboration with Orange County Schools -- is illustrative of some of the specifically designed partnerships aimed at mutual problem solving. In interviews with school personnel served by this partnership, some experienced teachers described their confidence in the instructional assistance they were receiving, and a public schools research director pointed to specific projects and studies undertaken by UCF in response to research questions raised in the field. Many of the UCF faculty members who were interviewed during the BOE visit made references to their work with schools and/or school personnel and to the benefits those interactions provided in program planning and delivery. At the undergraduate level, these benefits were exemplified in the development of the junior-level student-teaching program; at the graduate level in the development of the Danforth Program for training school administrators.

The interviews and documents evidenced mutual respect fostered by many specific, identifiable, collaborative programs such as these that were further strengthened by ongoing informal support relationships. People both at the University and in the schools could easily name specific individuals

with whom they felt comfortable and confident in professional problem solving. References to the responsiveness of these partnership programs to "school-based" problems generates high-level awareness and confidence that is reflected in the school's willingness to become involved in additional relationships.

The Unit has not developed specific arrangements with school districts to provide assistance to its graduates who are starting their professional education experiences. No plan is in place to accomplish this, although requests for assistance from the graduates bring response from the Unit.

Strengths

A strength of the College was noted in its activities designed to fulfill its objective of "seeking ways to enhance the quality of instruction in Florida's county-based public school systems." The Teacher Education Center, Institute for Professional Development, and collaborative research efforts with local school districts are examples of this area of strength as noted by the NCATE BOE.

Recommendations

1. Additional staff positions should be allocated to the College of Education in response to the increased student enrollment and to promote program integrity by decreasing the extensive use of part-time faculty.
2. More vigorous efforts should be undertaken to increase the number of minority students and faculty in the College of Education.
3. Given the predominance of community college transfers in the professional education programs, the College should enhance its relationships with "high use" community colleges both in terms of strengthening the recruitment and advisement programs, and in incorporating input from community college representatives in deliberations regarding the integration of general education, professional studies, and specialty studies.
4. The College should critically review and then plan modifications of field- based experiences and relevant courses to incorporate exposure to and coverage of culturally diverse populations and perspectives.

5. The College should review and potentially modify its system of assigning and rewarding (i.e., through the merit, promotion, and tenure process) advisement and supervision of field based experience responsibilities.
6. Although support for faculty continuing professional development was noted, the College might modify this system so as to identify priority areas responsive to new directions in education which would enhance the unit's curriculum, and to be responsive to perceived needs and trends of the surrounding school districts.
7. The College should more directly respond to the SUS's issue of institutions providing programs for the purpose of remediating "poor" teachers and NCATE's standard regarding assistance to beginning teachers.
8. Future program expansion should be initiated only after a thorough review of existing resources and programs with an eye toward reallocating resources.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

General Findings and Recommendations

The College of Education and Human Services is in generally good health, with a strong faculty, access to large numbers of excellent students, and close proximity to rapidly developing metropolitan area public school systems. However, the College has entered a critical period of transition involving four very important dimensions:

a. New University leadership and a shift in University mission to stronger academic and research programs, greater emphasis on regional development and K-12 relationships.
b. New College leadership expected to develop a mission, program revisions, and long-range plans that align with the University's mission and plans.
c. Expansion of programs in the College to the doctoral level of study.
d. Critical review, reconceptualization, and expansion of degree programs and teacher preparation activities while at the same time improving relationships with Arts and Sciences programs on campus and the public schools in the North Florida region.

These four dimensions constitute a heavy agenda for the College as it searches for new leadership and begins preparation for national re-accreditation in 1994.

The report of the special consultant points out a large number of strengths in academic program design and operations, student characteristics and performances, faculty, and administrative and governance features. At the same time, there are clear areas for improvement, particularly in the articulation of a mission statement for the College and in the close review and revision of its academic programs as they relate to a sound knowledge or research base.

A close review of the comprehensive response to BOR information requirements suggests that there are strong academic degree programs underlying the professional education programs. The response to the 1985 SUS program review is complete and apparently effective. However, there are several areas where work toward improvement needs to be accelerated:

a. Addressing the revision of undergraduate program requirements in teacher education to bring them within the 120-128 semester-hour range.

b. Improving efforts to recruit minorities into teacher education programs and larger numbers of students into critical areas of need such as math and science education. Care should be taken not to use the 10 percent exception policy to admit unqualified non-minority students.

c. Devising plans and developing the necessary resources for a faculty development program that will provide the necessary faculty support required for anticipated program expansions and improvements.

This report is organized around program design and evaluation, students, faculty, and governance and resources. For each of these sections, comments are made about strengths and needs. The report concludes with a set of recommendations relative to the totality of the program review and site visitation.

Program Design and Evaluation

Strengths

1. All programs presented for review at both the initial and advanced levels were found to be well articulated and fully operative. Each program appears to have clearly stated goals and objectives, and includes a programmatic plan for student matriculation.
2. Program designs at the initial level include components typically assumed to be incorporated in teacher preparation programs, including a well-articulated general or liberal studies component, a discipline major, general pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge, other core studies including social foundations and technology, and a thorough capstone practicum experience, referred to at UNF as the internship.
3. Program designs at the advanced level appear well articulated and incorporative of both a core set of foundational studies, as well as specific curriculum related to the educational personnel preparation programs offered at the master's and Ed.D. levels.
4. Particularly distinctive at the initial preparation level is the delivery of instruction organized around course modules. This manner of organizing coursework, though indigenous

particularly to competency-based teacher education programs, could continue to be a viable and creative way to deliver instruction, along with more traditional and alternative didactic designs.

5. All programs in the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) appear particularly responsive to local educational clientele. That is, most programs are well enrolled and there is evidence that recent graduates and professionals who enroll in graduate work are well served. The response is particularly positive with regard to the newly initiated Ed.D. in educational leadership.
6. In the reconceptualization of initial teacher education programs now underway in the COEHS, the attempts of certain programs to organize around student cohort groups is acknowledged as an effort at attaining program coherence and more active student involvement in the teacher education programs.
7. There is evidence of rigor and academic challenge as manifested in the initial programs. Students acknowledge coursework as important and reflective of academic and experiential knowledge bases appropriate to the initial preparation of teachers.
8. The COEHS has received considerable recognition with regard to its efforts to maintain an effective evaluation of its graduates. The COEHS has consistently conducted follow-up surveys of its graduates and their employing school officials in order to assess the competence of these beginning teachers. Graduates of the initial preparation program have also successfully completed both the Florida Performance Measurement System and the Florida Beginning Teacher Program.

Needs

1. All program initiatives within the COEHS must be guided by a well-articulated statement of the College's mission, its vision of its role relative to the larger University and the region served by UNF. Such a statement of mission, then, would allow for the articulation of a long-range plan for the COEHS, beyond current staffing plans. This vision would be a

71

foundational link to revisions and reconceptulizations of the teacher education and school personnel programs offered by the College.

2. The COEHS has begun a major reconceptualization of its teacher education programs and a review of all advanced preparation programs. This reconceptualization is to be encouraged, given the strong persuasion of the College to shift away from a competency-based teacher education program to one more grounded in a notion of teachers as decision makers and problem solvers. This reconceptualization should reflect explicit and well-articulated views of learning, teaching, schooling, and the process of "learning to teach."
3. The reconceptualization of COEHS programs must make explicit the linkages of these conceptions noted above to specific representations of extant knowledge bases, including studies of teaching and learning, and schooling, and more experientially based studies of practice.
4. The College offers a full range of undergraduate (initial) teacher preparation programs, master's programs and more recently the Ed.D. in educational leadership. Many faculty assume instructional leadership at all levels of the College's programming. Careful review of the potential interrelationships of these various programs may relieve the degree to which some faculty are overextended. For instance, the master's program in teacher education could be more explicitly marketed for expert, veteran teachers who upon completion of the degree might take a clinical faculty role in the initial program; the same leadership preparation links are possible at the doctoral level. Such programmatic "layering" might help faculty focus their efforts and differentiate responsibilities more effectively.
5. There is a need to focus more carefully on the foundational core in both the initial preparation programs and in the master's degree areas. Already there is a reasonably sound core of foundational studies in both, but faculty appear overextended in certain areas of the undergraduate program and particularly in social foundations. At the master's level, the two-course core could potentially be expanded to include approaches to classroom inquiry and more contemporary studies of teaching and learning, and schooling.

6. While there are instances of program evaluation and student assessment being administered at both the initial and advanced levels, there is no particular link to findings emanating from current follow-up studies of graduates. Efforts to chart retention in minority recruitment programs could well be extended to the entire population of students, including expanding portfolio development as a form of student and program assessment. There is a need to evidence the impact of current and future program evaluation in revising programs and to document the quality of program graduates though outcomes assessments.

Students

Strengths

1. The College of Education and Human Services has a well-articulated and effectively administered program of student recruitment, selection, and admissions. The net effect of such strategies is evidenced in the College's ability to attract capable students, who complete the program in a timely fashion and successfully meet exit measures.
2. There appear to be energetic and efficient student services. Responsibilities are executed in the context of a caring community relative to services offered to students on campus and in their placement in local school settings for field experiences and career placements.
3. The College's efforts to form articulation agreements with local community colleges, and particularly with the Florida Community College of Jacksonville and St. Johns River Community College, are exemplary. There is evidence that students in the COEHS, a majority of whom emanate from community colleges, can effectively transfer into the teacher education programs, given the good quality of student advisement in these institutions and in the College.
4. The College has several exemplary student advisement initiatives underway, including the Teacher Education for America's Minorities (TEAM) program, which is a minority recruitment and retention program sponsored by the Ford Foundation, and PREMIER, which is a minority recruitment program in concert with local community colleges.

Needs

1. Discussions regarding admissions standards suggest that faculty beliefs about attributes of effective teachers exceed the limited, though typical, admissions requirements currently utilized in force in the College. The College is encouraged to extend its selection process into the initial courses for purposes of adding more qualitative (or subjective) measures, if not for formal admission, at least for self-selection purposes. That is, the more teacher candidates know about themselves and the demands of the teaching role, the more capable they will be of judging their potential for success in the role. This process as facilitated during the teacher education program could help counter the high drop-out rate of teachers during their initial years of teaching, and assist in retaining those most ably suited for the profession.
2. The faculty are encouraged to extend recruitment and retention initiatives deemed successful in the TEAM and PREMIER programs to other populations currently served by the College, particularly with regard to important benchmark evaluations of student progress while in the teacher education programs and in the initial years of teaching. Although participation in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program is one such effort to extend support and assessment, those more reflective of the specific goals of the UNF program would also provide appropriate measures.
3. While recruitment initiatives through the Ford funded TEAM project and the PREMIER project appear highly successful, the allowances in the Florida system under the 10 percent rule are not being met. That is, allocations of student admissions for minority candidates below articulated admission standards are being awarded to other than minority candidates. An explication of this special population relative to admission standards exemptions is appropriate.

Faculty

Strengths

1. A review of faculty vita and opportunities to discuss programmatic concerns with many

members of the COEHS reflects a range of very capable and highly enthusiastic faculty at UNF. They are extremely committed to teaching and advising students and to their outreach initiatives with area schools. They also present their work and receive recognition for programmatic initiatives through national association annual meetings and in learned society journals and other publications.

2. While scholarly activity is encouraged throughout the COEHS, the College and its faculty continue to see the primary mission as one of instruction. This commitment is reflected in the way programs are organized, the level of faculty contribution to them, and the positive reactions faculty receive from current and former students.
3. The organization of the College into divisions and the subdivision into program areas appears to be an effective structure for conducting the work of the College. There is considerable leadership being exercised by the division chairs and program heads, as well as informal leadership initiatives by individual faculty. Particularly notable is the progress made in program conceptualization and development provided by the current dean of the COEHS since the last Florida State Department and National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education reviews.
4. Faculty exercise regular communication with colleagues in the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences as a function of strong informal relationships at the discipline level. Faculty obviously relate well with colleagues in the area county elementary and secondary schools, and with community college personnel.

Needs

1. Although immediate staffing plans have been made for the COEHS, the College is encouraged to develop, as a part of long-range planning initiatives referenced above, a long range staffing plan. This plan should project retirements and other forms of attrition, and project staffing for continuing academic core activities and new program initiatives.
2. Given the centrality of integrating appropriate knowledge bases within program

75

conceptualizations for both the initial and advanced programs, it is critical that faculty possess a working knowledge of research and theoretical studies. It is also vital that faculty not only serve as translators of those knowledge bases, but also contribute to the growth of knowledge in the field. These contributions should continue to be encouraged at all levels.

3. Central to program conceptualizations at the initial and advanced levels are core sequences in general pedagogy, human growth and development, social foundations and, at the advanced level, research methodology. Contributions to core courses should emanate from the recognized expertise of faculty who teach those courses.
4. While the College's efforts relative to collaboration with local schools is to be commended, the College is encouraged to extend developments with local teachers and other school personnel who contribute to program design and delivery. Specifically, selection of directing teachers requires careful oversight, as does the College's responsibility for adequately preparing these individuals for clinical faculty positions. In this instance, EXCEL (Excelling in Clinical Education Learning) and SPRINT (Supervisors of Pre-Intern Teachers) are excellent examples of school personnel development in critical instructional leadership roles.

Governance and Resources

Strengths

1. The organizational structure of the COEHS into divisions and program areas, as discussed above, appears to be an appropriate mechanism for accomplishing the responsibilities of the College. There is also an adequate standing committee structure for consultative decision making.
2. There are also committee structures relative to COEHS relations with other units on campus, particularly through the Office of Academic Affairs. Relationships with the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, though formerly provided for through PCOTE (President's Council on Teacher Education), appear to be operating at an informal level.

3. The Office of Academic Affairs is to be commended for providing for the coordination and oversight of graduate programs within the COEHS and across campus, through the vice president for academic affairs.
4. Collaborative relationships between the College and the area county schools, and particularly in Clay and Duval counties are to be commended. The EXCEL/SPRINT program is exemplary. It provides a structure for the cluster school concept, for the development of the clinical educator role for school-based faculty and for the conduct of more in-depth and better articulated field and internship experiences for students. Further, the Teacher Education Center is a vital outreach mechanism for the COEHS to provide services to local elementary and secondary schools. More recently, the development of the Duval County/COEHS partnership, called the Partnership in Educational Technology (PIET), with the Apple Corporation is an excellent initiative in technological instruction. Finally, the recent agreement between the College of Education and Human Services and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education with the AT&T Teachers for Tomorrow Program reflects the continuing commitment of the College to collaboration across local school districts and with the business community.
5. The Learning Laboratory represents the growing commitment within the College to technologically assisted instruction. This is an active and vital resource for students and faculty and reflects an appropriate array of technological support equipment and software. The range of uses includes fundamental media capability for prospective teachers, regular class projects across the curriculum which engage students in laboratory activities, and faculty initiatives to integrate technology into their instruction.

Needs

1. Although communication between the College of Education and Human Services and the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences appears to be operating effectively at the informal level, evidence of strong University-wide support for the education of teachers is best reflected in

77

the creation of a formal communication system. This might take the form of a standing University council on teacher education which reports to the head of the teacher education unit (the Dean of the COEHS). This group would advise the Dean on matters related to program articulation across elementary and secondary academic majors, collaborative projects with area schools, and the integration of the general studies curriculum toward the liberal education of teacher candidates. This structure would deliberate at the policy advisory level and is not intended to supplant or extend existing processes for academic review.

2. While developments relative to technology both within the COEHS and in collaboration with area schools are extremely innovative, they focus primarily on instructional technology prospective teachers can use in elementary and secondary classroom instruction. The College is encouraged to consider the creation of a "teaching laboratory" concept as well, wherein facilities and equipment are provided for the critical analysis of teaching practice.
3. With the designation of responsibility within the Office of Academic Affairs for the coordination of graduate programs, the University is encouraged to develop a consistent set of policies for the conduct of advanced teacher education and school personnel programs, including procedures for curriculum review, residency, and prerequisites and qualifications for graduate faculty status.

Recommendations

1. The College of Education and Human Services should develop a well-articulated statement of mission which incorporates the uniquenesses of the College and its centrality to the University and to the larger educational community, and which reflects a vision of what the College can become in the future. This mission, or vision statement, can provide the foundation for linking emerging programmatic conceptualizations that are currently under discussion in the departments and program areas.
2. Once the College has articulated its vision for the future, it must develop a long- range

planning process for prioritizing programmatic initiatives, staffing those program priorities, explicating the relationships between programs at the initial and advanced levels, and charting future relationships with local school districts. The College must be careful to focus its energies on program initiatives that are vital to educational developments in the region, that are central to the University's larger mission, and that are distinctive in nature.

3. Crucial to the College's efforts to reconceptualize programs at the initial and advanced levels is the degree to which programmatic coherence can be achieved. Coherent programs appear to be those that reflect a consensually articulated vision of teaching and learning, and schooling, as well as shared notions about the process of learning to teach. These may be separately articulated statements by each program area, drawing from some general principles that are common across programs. From such conceptual frameworks, themes could be derived that are reinforced throughout the curriculum. Program designs should also reflect the integration of representative knowledge bases that reflect the theoretical, empirical, and experiential studies in the field. Coherence is also achieved through sound articulation between the general studies and professional studies, and between school practice and on-campus didactic and clinical studies. It is further achieved through the demonstration of instructional approaches within the program that reinforce the vision of teaching and learning in the program design, and potentially through the organization of students into cohorts. Finally, formative and summative evaluation of programs and student assessment are vital to achieving coherent programs.

4. While the initiatives between the College of Education and Human Services and the area schools reflect many innovative projects cited above, the College is encouraged to expand its relationships with these schools in very purposeful ways. Using the cluster school concept, the College should strengthen and expand its activities to a limited but adequate number of sites where the professional development of beginning and continuing teachers is a shared mission of the College and these school sites. These should be sites where teachers are carefully selected and prepared for clinical educator roles, and where the teacher

development initiatives would be exemplary demonstrations of the best that is known about the preparation of teachers.

5. The College should consider the development of teaching laboratories that provide for the critical analysis of teaching practice. Traditional forms of micro teaching continue to be useful. Additionally, facilities for the use of interactive video, a library for the review of purposeful video tapes and protocols of actual classroom practice, and the development of simulations, cases, and classroom portfolios would greatly enhance the clinical or diagnostic capabilities of teacher candidates. These teaching laboratory facilities could be located both on campus and potentially in cluster schools where significant numbers of internships are conducted.
6. The College has initiated exemplary minority recruitment programs through its collaborative relationships with area schools and community colleges, and has established exemplary retention programs as well. The curriculum also reflects the substantial commitment of the College to multicultural education. Still, as elsewhere, the proportion of minority candidates in relation to the proportion of diversity of school populations requires that these initiatives could be expanded. UNF's experience in minority recruitment is an exemplar for others as the profession seeks a more diverse population of teachers.
7. The College is encouraged to expand its program evaluation and student assessment capacities to reflect a reasonable measure of the outcomes of its programs. As accountability for the quality of graduates becomes more the responsibility of the College and the University as opposed to a regulatory component of the State's review, the College must become more actively involved in measuring the worth of its programs and the quality of its graduates to positively affect school practice. The Florida Institute for Education could contribute to this initiative through longitudinal case studies of a selected population of the College's graduates who subsequently become professional teachers in Florida's schools.
8. The quality of leadership in the College of Education and Human Services will ultimately

spell the success of the program redesign initiative currently underway at the initial and advanced levels. The creation of the new Ed.D. in educational leadership is commendable as well. Much progress has been made in program development, as well as in laying the groundwork for significant collaboration with regional elementary and secondary schools through the Office of the Dean. At this time, the College has a significant opportunity to extend its leadership role in school improvement throughout the region and the state, and to provide models of exemplary practice for the profession at large. Beyond the Office of the Dean, sound academic and professional leadership has been demonstrated and must continue to be supported at the departmental and program-area levels as well. Individual faculty initiatives that foster the mutual goals of the College also must continue to be fostered. High quality classroom teachers and district administrators have distinguished themselves as major contributors to the College's programs. The high potential of the College of Education and Human Services can be met through the collective will of these important educators.

81

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

C U R R I C U L U M V I T A

D O N A L D J O H N S T E D M A N

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION:

Dean and Professor of Education
School of Education
Campus Box # 3500
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599-3500
919/966-2436

Home Address: 6601 Huntingridge Road
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
919/490-3260

Education: Public Schools - New York State, Regents, 1949, Science
St. Bonaventure University, B.A., cum laude, 1953, Sociology
University of Rochester, M.A., 1959, Psychology
Clinical and Research Internship, Sonoma State Hospital and the Berkeley Child Study Center, University of California at Berkeley, 1961
George Peabody College for Teachers (Vanderbilt University), Ph.D., 1962, Psychology

Military Service: U. S. Army (1953-55), Captain, Army Reserve (1955-62)

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS:

Assistant Professor, Medical Psychology and Child Psychiatry, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, 1963-67.
Associate Professor, Medical Psychology and Child Psychiatry, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC, 1968.
Lecturer, Department of Education, Duke University, Durham, NC, 1964-68.
Visiting Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1964-68.
Lecturer, Department of Psychology, Duke University, Durham, NC, 1964-68.
Member, Faculty on Research Training, Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development, Duke University, 1966-68.
Visiting Associate Professor of Education, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Summer, 1968.
Associate Professor of Psychology, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1968-71.
Associate Professor of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, Tennessee, 1968-71.
Professor of Education, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971-present.

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENTS (continued)

Member, Faculty of the Bush Institute for Child and Family Policy, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, UNC-Chapel Hill, 1982-present.
Visiting Lecturer, School of Education, College of Advanced Education, Canberra, Australia, October, 1987.
Fulbright Scholar, New Zealand-United States Educational Foundation, Auckland, New Zealand, January 1990.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS:

Associate Director, Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, Washington, DC, 1962-63.
Assistant to Special Assistant to the President on Mental Retardation, and Coordinator, White House Conference on Mental Retardation, Washington, DC, 1963.
Co-Director, Pediatric Psychiatry Training Program, Duke University Medical Center, 1963-68.
Research Director, Ford Foundation Education Improvement Program, Duke University, 1965-68.
Associate Director, John F. Kennedy Center for Research on Education and Human Development, George Peabody College, 1968-70.
Director, John F. Kennedy Center for Research on Education and Human Development, George Peabody College, 1970-71.
Director of Human Development Programs, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, 1968-71.
Chairman, Division of Behavioral Sciences in Education, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971-73.
Associate Director, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971-76.
Chairman, Division of Special Education, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1975-77.
Special Assistant to the Senior Vice President and Director, Teacher Education Review Program, The University of North Carolina System, 1976-78.
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, The University of North Carolina System, July 1978-June 1979.
Acting Vice President for Research and Public Service Programs, The University of North Carolina System, July 1979-January 1981.
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, The University of North Carolina System, February 1981-August 1990.
Dean, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, September 1990-present.

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE:

Practicing Psychologist, North Carolina, 1968-present.

PROFESSIONAL AND CONSULTATIVE APPOINTMENTS:

Member, Scientific Review Committee, Kennedy Laboratories, Massachusetts General Hospital, 1962-63.
Consultant, Scientific Advisory Board, Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation, 1963-65.
Consultant, President's Committee on Mental Retardation, White House, Washington, DC, 1963.

PROFESSIONAL AND CONSULTATIVE APPOINTMENTS (continued)

Consultant, Office of the Special Assistant to the President on Mental Retardation, 1963-65.
Consultant in Mental Health, Young and Rubicam, Inc., New York City, 1963-67.
Member, Advisory Committees on Mental Retardation, Civitan International and No Carolina Civitan, 1964-68.
Member, Committee on Mental Health, North Carolina Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1964-67.
Consultant, Governor's Council on Mental Retardation, North Carolina, 1964-68.
President-Elect, North Carolina Association for Retarded Children, 1965; President, 1966.
Member, Mental Retardation Projects Review Panel, U.S. Public Health Service, Mental Retardation Division, Bureau of Health Services, 1965-67.
Member, Coordinating Committee, Project Headstart, Durham, NC, 1965.
Field Selection Officer, Peace Corps, Worldwide Doctor's Program, 1965.
Consultant, Office of the Special Assistant on Mental Retardation to the Secre of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966-67.
Chairman, Committee on U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce Mental Retardation Programs, National Association for Retarded Children, 1965-66.
Member, Advisory Board, "Juniper Gardens" Project, Bureau of Child Research, U of Kansas, 1965-68.
Permanent Consultant, President's Committee on Mental Retardation, 1966-73.
Consultant, Mental Retardation Division, Bureau of Health Services, U.S. Publi Health Service, 1967; Mental Retardation Division, Rehabilitation Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, DHEW, 1967-70.
Member, Committee on Ethics in Research with Children, Division 7 (Developmen Psychology), American Psychological Association, 1967-68.
Member, Research Advisory Council, U.S. Office of Education, 1968-70.
Member, Governor's Advisory Council on Mental Retardation, State of Tennessee, 1968-71.
Member, Board of Directors, Tennessee Association for Retarded Children, 1968-
Chairman, Advisory Board, Tennessee Association for Retarded Children, 1970-71
Vice President for Psychology, Southeastern Region, American Association on M Deficiency, 1969-71.
Member, Advisory Council, Education Professions Development Act Programs, USO Washington, DC, 1968-70.
Member, Board of Directors, Council of Community Services, Nashville, Tenness 1969-70.
Member, Planning Board, American Association on Mental Deficiency, 1969-70.
Principal Investigator and Communications Coordinator, Technical Assistance Development System, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, Univers of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971-73.
Consultant, Education Committee, North Carolina Association for Retarded Chil 1972-73.
Consultant, Division of Developmental Disabilities, Social and Rehabilitation Services, Washington, DC, 1972-77.
Consultant, Office of Coordination of Mental Retardation, Department of Heal Education and Welfare, Washington, DC, 1971-74.
Project Director, Review of Intervention Research Programs, Office of Assista Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health, Education an Welfare, Washington, DC, 1972.
Member, Advisory Board, National Center on Law and the Handicapped, Notre Dam University, South Bend, Indiana, 1973-75.
Member, Advisory Panel on Child Mental Health Services, NIMH Project, Genera Research Corp., McLean, Virginia, 1973-75.

PROFESSIONAL AND CONSULTATIVE APPOINTMENTS (continued)

Member, Major Advisors Group, Technical Assistance Development Systems, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1972-78.

Member, Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System National Advisory Board, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1973-78.

Chairman, Advisory Council, North Carolina Association for Retarded Citizens, 1974-84.

Chairman, Cooperative Planning Consortium of Special Education Programs, The University of North Carolina System, 1974-76 (Office of Vice President for Planning). Member, representing The University of North Carolina System, 1977-present.

Chairman, Committee on Handicapped Citizens, North Carolina Civitan International, 1974-75.

Member, Research and Evaluation Advisory Committee, North Carolina Department of Correction, 1974-75.

Member, Mental Health Council, Office of the Secretary of Human Resources, State of North Carolina, 1975-77.

Principal Consultant, Office for Handicapped, Office of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, DC, 1975-77.

Member, Technical Advisory Committee, North Carolina Statewide Prekindergarten Screening Program, State Department of Human Resources, 1975-76.

Member, Advisory Committee, Institute for the Development of Human Resources, A Division of Random House, Inc., New York City, 1976-78.

Member, Executive Committee and Chairman, Advocacy Committee, The National Higher Education Consortium of Special Education Programs, 1976-78.

Member, National Advisory Board, National Learning Disabilities Assistance Project, Merrimac, Massachusetts, 1977-79.

Member, Advisory Council on Teacher Education, State Department of Public Instruction, North Carolina, 1977-78.

Member, Council on Educational Services for Exceptional Children, State Board of Education, North Carolina, 1977-78.

Member, Commission on Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services, State of North Carolina, 1978-84; member, Executive Committee and Chairman, Committee on Mental Retardation, 1978-82; Chairman, Standards Committee, 1981-85.

Member, Review Panel, Title XX Training Contracts, Department of Human Resources, State of North Carolina, 1978-79.

Member, National Advisory Council, Project CHILD, College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, 1978-79.

Member, State Evaluation Committee on Teacher Education, State Board of Education, North Carolina, 1978-81.

Co-Chairperson, Task Force on Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Governor's Conference on Mental Health, North Carolina, 1979.

Member, Committee on North Carolina Criminal Justice Education and Training System, N. C. Department of Justice, 1979.

Member, Board of Advisors, Josephine Kugel Foundation, McLean, Virginia, 1978-81.

Member, Advisory Council, North Carolina Program Managers Training System, State Personnel Department, 1979-81.

Member, Task Force on Academic Psychiatry, American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 1980-82.

Member, Liaison Committee, Quality Assurance Program, State Board of Education, North Carolina, 1979-81.

Member, Governor's Task Force on Volunteerism from the Workplace, North Carolina, 1981.

PROFESSIONAL AND CONSULTATIVE APPOINTMENTS (continued)

Member, Task Force on Higher Education and the Public Schools, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Georgia, 1981-83.

Member, Planning Committee, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Education Commission of the States, 1982-83.

Member, Planning Committee, Governor's Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, North Carolina, 1983-84.

Visiting Committee Chair, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools: Mississippi State University - 1983; Texas A & I University - 1984; Tennessee Technological University - 1985.

Member, Governor's Planning Committee, North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching, 1984-85.

Chairman, Review Panel, Review of Colleges of Education, State University System of Florida, 1984-85.

Chairman, Statewide Conference on the Prevention of Developmental Disabilities, 1985.

Member, Technical Advisory Committee, Legislative Study of Vocational Education in North Carolina, 1985-86.

Representative for the President, North Carolina Delegation, Education Commission of the States, 1985-86.

Consultant, Review of Teacher Education Programs, State of Kentucky, MGT, Inc., Tallahassee, Florida, 1985.

Staff Director, UNC Board of Governors Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers, 1985-87.

Senior Consultant in Education, Florida Board of Regents, 1985-present.

Chairman, Review Panel, College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1987.

Member, Board of Trustees, Bancroft School, Haddonfield, NJ/Owls Head, Maine, 1982-1987.

Co-Coordinator, The Presidential Candidates Forum, The University of North Carolina and the North Carolina Center for Public Television, Chapel Hill, NC, September 1987. (A nationally televised forum and debate among Democrat and Republican candidates for President of the United States in the "Super Tuesday" primary.)

Chairman, Board of Trustees and Advisory Board, Model Services Program of North Carolina, Inc., 1984-88.

Chairman, Review Panel, Review of Colleges of Education, Arkansas Department of Higher Education, 1987-88.

Member, Review Panel, Centers of Excellence Program, South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, 1987-89.

Member, Human Resources Development Task Force, N.C. Dept. of Human Resources, May 1988-June 1989.

Co-moderator and Consultant in Education, Executive Seminars, Aspen Institute, 1988-present (Aspen, Colorado and Wye, Maryland Centers).

Member, Advisory Panel, Center for Early Adolescence, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1990-present.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BOARDS OF TRUSTEES AND ADVISORY COUNCILS: CURRENT MEMBERSHIP

Member, National Advisory Council, Illinois Institute on Developmental Disabilities, Chicago (chair).
Member, Advisory Council, NC Mathematics and Science Education Network, UNC-Chapel Hill.
Member, Chancellor's Advisory Council, Principals' Executive Program, UNC-Chapel Hill.
Member, Board of Directors, NC Association for Children with Learning Disabilities.
Member, President's Advisory Council, Association for Retarded Citizens of NC, Inc. (chair).
Member, Advisory Board, NC Society for Autistic Adults and Children, Inc.
UNC Board of Governors Liaison to the Board of Trustees of the North Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching.
Representative for the UNC President on the Board of Directors, Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory, Research Triangle Park, NC.
Representative for the UNC President on the Board of Directors, The Public School Forum of North Carolina.
Member, National Advisory Committee, Carolina Policy Studies Program, UNC-Chapel Hill.
Member, National Advisory Council, the National Center for the Paideia Program, UNC-Chapel Hill.
Member, Advisory Committee, The SREB/Kenan Fund Literacy Project.
Member, Board of Directors, the National Center for Family Literacy, Inc., Louisville, Kentucky.
Member, Board of Directors, Orange County Literacy Council, Chapel Hill, NC.
Member, Board of Trustees, InterServ, New York, NY.
Member, Coordinating Task Force, the New Hope Model School Project, Orange County Schools, North Carolina (Vice Chair).
Member, Advisory Council, Southern Education Foundation/Ford Foundation - North Carolina consortium to increase the number of minority teachers in the public schools.

EDITORIAL EXPERIENCE

Editor, Research and Training Section, Mental Retardation, 1962-63.
Associate Editor, American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1971-74.
Member, Editorial Board, John Day Publishing Co., New York City, 1970-75.
Consulting Editor, Exceptional Children, The Council for Exceptional Children, Washington, DC, 1971-77.
Consulting Editor, Child Development Abstracts, Society for Research in Child Development, 1972-77.
Consulting Editor, Special Education in Transition (Special issues journal), The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), 1980-1990.
Editorial Consultant, Carolina Journal of Educational Research, Greenville, NC, 1980-1990.

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Member, Training Committee, Project for Training Teachers of Emotionally Disturbed Children, Duke University, Durham, NC 1964-68.
Chairman, Mental Retardation Committee, Duke University Department of Psychiatry, 1964-68.

ACADEMIC COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS (continued)

Member, Advisory Committee, Duke University Regional Education Programs, 1967-68.
Secretary, Board of Governors, Duke University Faculty Club, 1967-68.
Member, Graduate Instruction Committee, George Peabody College, Nashville, TN, 1968-71.
Member, Council on Academic Affairs, George Peabody College, Nashville, TN, 1970-71.
Member, Committee on Medical Education, Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, Nashville, TN, 1969-71.
Member, Board of Advisors, Children's Regional Medical Center, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, 1970-71.
Chairman, Government Grants Committee, Peabody College Campaign, Nasvhille, TN, 1970-71.
Member, President's Administrative Cabinet, Peabody College, Nashville, TN, 1970-71.
Member, Advisory Board, Biological Sciences Research Center, UNC Medical Center, Chapel Hill, NC, 1971-73.
Member, Dean's Cabinet, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971-74, 1975-77.
Member, Executive Committee, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971-73; 1975-76.
Chairman, Program Review Committee, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1972.
Member, Self-Study Committee, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1972.
Member, University Research Council, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1973-77.
Chairman, School of Education Resource Assessment Project, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1973-75.
Chairman, Social Sciences and Professional Schools Committee, University Research Council, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1974-78.
Member, Advisory Board, Group Child Care Consultant Services, School of Social Work, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1975-79.
Chairman, University Council on Research, The University of North Carolina System, 1979-81.
Chairman, University Council on Teacher Education, The University of North Carolina System, 1978-present.
Chairman, University Council on Continuing Education, The University of North Carolina System, 1979-81.
Chairman, University Council on Urban Studies, The University of North Carolina System, 1979-81.
Member, Advisory Council, Institute for Transportation Research and Education, The University of North Carolina System, 1979-81.
Chairman, University Council on Environmental Studies, The University of North Carolina System, 1979-81.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIPS

Society for Research in Child Development
North Carolina Association for Retarded Citizens
Society for College and University Planning
American Educational Research Association

RESEARCH INTERESTS

Human Development Research and Training, Research Program Administration, Consultation and Technical Assistance Systems, Program Planning and Evaluation in Higher Education, Child Development Research and Social Policy, Higher Education Administration, Teacher Education.

Stedman, D.J. (1969). A recipe for improving residential care: Add a dash of capitalism. Mind Over Matter (Tennessee Department of Mental Health), 14 (2), 13-16.

Stedman, D.J. (1969). Special education: A condition for renewal of American education. Mental Retardation, 7 (3), 51-52.

Stedman, D.J., Clifford, M., & Spitznagel, A. (1969). A comparison of parent and teacher ratings on the preschool attainment record of 17 five-year-old disadvantaged children. Journal of Exceptional Children, 35 (6), 488-89.

Stedman, D.J., & Olley, J.G. (1969). Bibliography of the world's clinical and research literature on Down's syndrome, behavioral, social and educational studies through 1968. IMRID Papers and Reports, 6 (2), 1-57.

Anastasiow, N., Stedman, D.J., & Spaulding, R. (1970). Language and reading achievement among disadvantaged nursery and primary grade children. The Slow Learning Child, 17 (1), 39-51.

Haywood, H.C., & Stedman, D.J. (1970). Poverty and mental retardation (Department of Health, Education and Welfare Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Leventhal, D.S., & Stedman, D.J. (1970). A factor analytic study of the ITPA. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 26, 473-77.

Stedman, D.J. (1970). The application of learning principles in pediatric practice. Pediatric Clinics of North America, 17 (2), 427-36.

Stedman, D.J. (1970). The hypothetical community, a template for planning mental retardation programs. North Carolina Journal of Mental Health, 4 (3), 26-29.

Stedman, D.J. (Ed.). (1971). Current issues in mental retardation and human development (Department of Health, Education and Welfare Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Stedman, D.J. (1971). Styles and values in research training in special education. In Institute on Advanced Graduate Study in Special Education (Proceedings). Nashville: Peabody College.

Stedman, D.J. (Ed.). (1972). Current issues in mental retardation and human development. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OS 73-86).

Stedman, D.J. (1973). Beyond getting it all together. In All little wagons are not red. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Stedman, D.J., & Black, T. (1973). What to do until a lawyer comes. In The American county. Washington, DC: National Association of Counties.

Stedman, D.J., & Surles, R. (1973). Essentials of program planning and evaluation. In Synergism for the '70s. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Stedman, D.J. (March 1974). Is special education dead? In Proceedings of Special Education Institute on the Right to Education Mandate. Chapel Hill, NC.

Stedman, D.J. (1974). The challenge of 1984. In Proceedings of Conference on Mental Retardation - 1984. Morganton, NC: Western Carolina Center.

Stedman, D.J. (1974). The three faces of UAFs. Mental Retardation, 12 (4), 56-58.

Baucom, L., & Stedman, D.J. (1975). A survey of the membership of state and territorial Developmental Disabilities Councils: Relevant characteristics and observations, 1974. Mental Retardation, 13 (5), 12-15.

Stedman, D.J. (1975). Education's missing link. Theory Into Practice, 14 (2), 143-45.

Stedman, D.J. (1975). The State Planning and Advisory Council on Developmental Disabilities. Mental Retardation, 13 (3), 4-8.

Stedman, D.J. (1975). The technical assistance system: A new organizational form for improving education. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed.), National technical assistance systems in special education (Conference Proceedings). Washington, DC: Conference on Educational Support Systems.

Stedman, D.J. (1975). Training teachers for the "action areas." North Carolina Education, 5 (9), 15-16.

Stedman, D.J., Anastasiow, N., Dokecki, P., Gordon, I., & Parker, R. (1975). How can effective early intervention programs be delivered to potentially retarded children? Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. (Monograph)

Ramey, C.T., Stedman, D.J., Borders-Patterson, A., Mengel, W., & Woods, B. (1976). Birth to first grade: The prediction of psychological and educational status. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center. (Report to the North Carolina Division of Health Services, N.C. State Department of Human Resources)

Smith, R.R., & Stedman, D.J. (1976). Cooperative manpower planning for special education in North Carolina. In Cooperative manpower planning in special education: First Missouri Symposium, May 1976 (Proceedings). Columbia: University of Missouri, Department of Special Education.

Stedman, D.J. (1976). Advocacy. In Training for DD Council orientation (Report of Three Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System and National Conference on Developmental Disabilities Orientation Training Conferences). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System.

Stedman, D.J. (1976). Book review of Review of Child Development Research by Frances D. Horowitz (Ed.). American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 81 (1), 109.

Stedman, D.J. (1976). Important considerations in the review and evaluation of educational intervention programs. Viewpoints, 52 (4), 1-14. (Bulletin of the Indiana University School of Education)

Stedman, D.J. (1976). Know your business: An introduction to orientation. In Training for DD Council orientation (Report of Three Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System and National Conference on Developmental Disabilities Orientation Training Conferences). Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Developmental Disabilities Technical Assistance System.

Stedman, D.J. (1976). Service delivery systems for handicapped individuals in the United States (Position paper for the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Stedman, D.J. (1976). State Council on Developmental Disabilities. Journal of Exceptional Children, 42 (4), 186-92.

Caldwell, B.M., & Stedman, D.J. (Eds.). (1977). Infant education: A guide for helping handicapped children in the first three years. Walker and Company.

Paul, J.L., Stedman, D.J., & Neufeld, G.R. (Eds.). (1977). Deinstitutionalization: Program and policy development. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Stedman, D.J. (1977). The university and teacher education. North Carolina Education, 7 (7), 10-12.

Stedman, D.J., & Baucom, L.D. (1977). A comparison of State Developmental Disabilities Council member characteristics. Mental Retardation, 15 (1), 3-6.

Stedman, D.J., & Smith, R.R. (1977). Partnership planning in professional personnel preparation: The university-state agency connection. Teacher Education and Special Education, 1 (1), 58-66. (Council for Exceptional Children)

Haskins, R., Finkelstein, N.W., & Stedman, D.J. (1978). Infant stimulation programs and their effects. Pediatric Annals, 7 (2), 123-44.

Haskins, R., Ramey, C.T., Stedman, D.J., Blacher-Dixon, J., & Pierce, J.E. (1978). Effects of repeated assessment on standardized test performance by infants. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 83 (3), 233-39.

Ramey, C.T., Stedman, D.J., Borders-Patterson, A., & Mengel, W. (1978). Predicting school failure from information available at birth. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 82 (6), 525-53.

Stedman, D.J. (1990). The professional preparation of teachers and early childhood educators: Changes in the wind. The Australasian Journal of Special Education. 13(2), 14-19.

Stedman, D.J. (in press). Striving for excellence: Opportunities taken, lessons learned. Proceedings of the South Pacific International Conference on Special Education, pp. ___-___. Bedford Park, Australia: Australian Association of Special Education and New Zealand Special Education Association.

Stedman, D.J. (1991). Re-Inventing the Schools of Education. Vital Speeches of the Day, LVII (13), 400-402.

(6/91)

APPENDIX B

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE FLORIDA BOARD OF REGENTS, THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AND THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Preamble

Florida is committed to the preparation of quality teachers through state approved teacher education programs within the state's public and independent institutions of higher education. To ensure the quality of teacher preparation programs within the State University System and to reduce unnecessary duplication of quality control measures through various state and national evaluative reviews, the Board of Regents, the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education, and the Department of Education's Office of Program Approval have developed a plan to conduct joint teacher education program reviews.

The National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education, the Department of Education's Office of Program Approval, and the Board of Regents agree the following guidelines will govern the joint review process.

IT IS AGREED THAT:

The Joint Teacher Education Program Review is a collaborative effort to assess, approve, and accredit quality teacher preparation programs within the State University System. The three agencies, **The National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE), The Department of Education (DOE), and The Board of Regents (BOR)** will jointly conduct their respective review processes for all professional education programs under their jurisdiction. The process will be designed to fit the needs of the teacher education units/programs, the universities, the state, and NCATE. Coordination will occur in the organizational, self-study, and site visit phases. The final reports, and in the case of the DOE and NCATE final approval, will be independent.

2. As part of the review process, the NCATE Preconditions

Documentation Report & the Institutional Report will be used by the BOR and the DOE concurrently with supplemental self-study reports, i.e., BOR Addendum and the DOE Curriculum Folios respectively, prepared by the institutions under review. The Institutional Report contains a Professional Education Unit's responses to NCATE standards and criteria as outlined in the NCATE "Standards, Procedures, and Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units." The BOR and DOE supplemental reports are intended to provide a state and system perspective. This perspective is not included in the NCATE Institutional Report. Institutions participating in the program review will be provided with a self-study guide outlining the content and format of the reports from each of the state agencies.

3. On-site visits to professional education units under review will be conducted by all three agencies according to the schedule set by the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education and agreed to by the DOE, BOR, and the universities. In the case of an institution wanting to change the review timetable, the BOR must approve the change prior to the institution contacting the other agencies. The decision to postpone must be agreed upon jointly by all reviewing agencies.

   The DOE review team will collaborate with the NCATE Board of Examiners to evaluate and vote on unit standards for NCATE and program specific recommendations for DOE program approval. The BOR Lead Consultant and Staff will accompany the team throughout the review process, but will not be voting members in the determination of met or unmet NCATE standards. In addition, the BOR lead consultant will

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

accompany the NCATE chair and the DOE team representative to the final meeting with the Unit head wherein the team's findings will be discussed. The composition of the NCATE, BOR, DOE team members is the responsibility of each of the agencies involved.

4. The BOR lead consultant will be selected by the universities and the Board of Regents staff through the usual program review procedure. One of the six NCATE selected Board of Examiners (BOE) (preferably the BOE chair or assistant chair) will be selected by the BOR lead consultant, the BOR office, and the university to serve as university consultant. The university consultant will be responsible for carrying out the assigned duties of members of the Board of Examiners, as well as, the duties of a BOR university consultant. The dual role of the BOE chair/ university consultant will necessitate that NCATE responsibilities be fulfilled first, followed by the responsibilities to the BOR as university consultant. The lead and university consultants, with the assistance of BOR staff, will identify and assign responsibilities to be carried out during the review process, as well as a timetable to accomplish the identified tasks. The BOR will orient the consultants prior to the site visit.

5. Upon completion of the on-site, visit the DOE and BOR consultants will meet to discuss the DOE team's assessment of the quality of the teacher education programs and the team's overall findings. The university consultant will draft a preliminary institutional report to be used by the lead consultant as a resource in writing a system-wide report for the Board of Regents.

6. Each agency will forward a copy of its final report and any additional communication related to the accreditation, approval, and/or evaluation of a university's programs to the other agencies.

7. All agencies will work cooperatively to review and improve the joint review process. Representatives from each of the agencies will meet after each site visit to discuss ways in which the review process could be improved to more effectively carry out the mission of the joint review and to assure the fulfillment of Florida's commitment to prepare quality teachers for the state's schools.

8. The Commissioner, Chancellor, and NCATE President (or designees) will convene to review the process after one complete round of institutional reviews.

Commissioner, Department of Education

6-20-91
Date

Chancellor, Board of Regents

6/17/91
Date

President, National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education

7/3/91
Date

APPENDIX C

105

State University System

Master Plan Goals for Teacher Education

Progress Report

Betty Castor

Commissioner of Education

July 26, 1989

Goals

One year ago this month, the Board of Regents accepted an ambitious challenge for our teacher education programs. The Board affirmed that in the course of the next five years, the State University System will increase its support for preservice and inservice teacher education activities and build stronger ties with the public schools.

The specific goals for teacher education included:

1. Supplying 60% of the new teachers needed in Florida each year.

2. Restructuring preservice teacher education programs to provide greater coordination among curriculum components (general education, professional education, and subject matter), to establish realistic caps on professional education requirements, and to involve the community colleges in the delivery of appropriate professional coursework.

3. Measuring teacher education program quality by national standards.

4. Fostering increased interest in the teaching profession, especially among minorities.

5. Providing increased service to the public schools.

6. Conducting research on teaching and learning.

Progress

During May and June of this year, each of our universities presented progress reports on its efforts toward achieving these goals. While we are making progress, still more needs to be done.

The institutional reports included responses to specific questions about:

1. plans to increase the numbers of graduates from approved teacher education programs;

2. additional resources the Colleges of Education have received or anticipate receiving;

3. how the universities assure that students have the opportunity to complete an approved program within two years beyond the Associate in Arts degree (or within three years in the case of the University of Florida);

4. how professional programs are coordinated with the community colleges;

5. services performed for the public schools; and

6. institutional plans to achieve all of the Master Plan goals for teacher education.

Promising Developments

A number of promising developments were reported:

1. The total number of students admitted to teacher education programs is up at seven of our universities (FAMU, FAU, FIU, FSU, UCF, UNF, & UWF) for 1988-89. [Refer to Table 1.]

2. Four universities (FAMU, UCF, UNF, & FIU) have recently received or anticipate receiving additional faculty positions.

3. Two universities (FAMU & FIU) are planning major curriculum reviews, with modification and consolidation of courses being one of the primary goals.

4. One university (FSU) is redirecting students from elementary education programs into critical teacher shortage areas.

5. All nine universities are involved in fostering interest in teaching as a career. UCF is working on a model minority recruitment program with Orange County.

6. Three of the five Department of Education sponsored alternate preparation centers are located at state universities (FAMU/FSU, FAU, & UCF).

7. All of our Colleges of Education are accredited or are in the process of attaining accreditation by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

8. Designating teacher education programs as limited access programs has not adversely affected admissions or minority enrollment.

9. The Department of Education Teacher Education Program Approval Process is one of sixteen nationally approved by NCATE.

10. The Board of Regents staff is working with NCATE and with the DOE Bureau of Teacher Education to coordinate the NCATE review process, the BOR program review process, and the DOE teacher education program approval process. The BOR teacher education program review in 1989-90 will be the first such coordinated review.

Where We Need To Do More

Despite the progress described above, there are areas where we need to do more:

1. In several of our teacher education curricula, the course and credit hour requirements are such that a typical student cannot complete the program in the standard four-year time frame. And most of our universities are reluctant to have community colleges offer any professional coursework.

   Recommendations

   a. Our universities must collaborate with the community colleges to encourage students to enter the teaching profession. The universities should follow the lead FSU and FAMU have set with a model articulation agreement between Tallahassee Community College, FSU and FAMU, where the two universities accept credit for the Education Foundations course taught at the community college in lieu of the university Education Foundations course. Information on students who

took the Tallahassee Community College course shows that as many as two-thirds of the students are now enrolled in university teacher education programs.

b. Early field experiences should be offered by all community colleges.

2. Although there is a considerable amount of service being provided to the public schools, service is not on an equal footing with teaching or research as a basis for tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. Therefore, faculty are discouraged from heavy involvement in providing service to the public schools.

Even though Rule 6C-5.221, F.A.C., clearly states that such service should be considered in tenure and promotion recommendations, discussions with the College of Education Deans raised some questions as to whether service is being given full consideration at the department and college level.

Recommendations

a. The presidents should get involved with their Colleges of Education the way they are with their Colleges of Business, Engineering and Medicine. The presidents should work with their vice presidents to see that service to the public schools is reflected in tenure and promotion recommendations.

b. Our universities need to conduct more research on ways to improve teaching and learning in our public schools. Four of our universities have lab schools which provide a perfect opportunity for research studies and demonstration projects. Each College of Education should establish an annual agenda for faculty and doctoral research based on a survey of public school needs and Department of Education priorities.

c. A feedback mechanism needs to be developed to routinely share research findings with the public schools, community colleges, and the Department of Education. One possibility would be to publish a journal through the State University System Press similar to Research in Action published by Virginia Commonwealth University.

d. The Florida Institute of Education is a Type I Center in the State University System responsible for public school, community college, and state university collaboration. The Florida Institute

of Education should play a leadership role in providing service to the public schools and conducting research on ways to improve our public schools.

3. Although the number of Black graduates of teacher education programs does not seem to be decreasing in Florida [Refer to Table 2.] as it is in many other parts of the country, we must do more to ensure sufficient Black representation in the teaching profession. This representation is critical because 23.7% of Florida's current public school students are Black.

   In 1988, only 15.2% of Florida's public school teachers were Black. [Refer to Table 3.]

   Recommendations

   a. Our universities should develop specific strategies to recruit minorities into teaching. For example, curriculum modifications and a well-planned 2+2 articulation program to encourage a smooth transition from associate in arts programs into teacher education programs could enhance our minority recruitment efforts significantly.

   b. Each university should set goals for minority enrollment in its College of Education as called for in the SUS Master Plan.

   c. The 10% alternate admissions policy is being used less frequently as a strategy to recruit minorities into teacher education programs. [Refer to Table 4.] Each university should use the 10% alternate admissions policy as a minority recruitment strategy for its teacher education programs. [Refer to Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8.]

4. Although the total number of students admitted to teacher education programs is up at seven of our universities, we must do more to direct teacher education enrollments to critical teacher shortage areas.

   Elementary education, an area where teacher shortages are not projected, continues to have the largest student enrollments. [Refer to Table 9.]

5. The curriculum for the majority of our teacher education programs has not changed significantly in decades. Potential teachers are not taking enough math and science content courses. Our files are full of

transcripts of elementary teacher candidates who have taken either no math or no science. Nor are potential teachers taught effective math and science teaching methods. They are not being effectively taught how to use instructional technology. They are not being taught the decision-making, team-building and problem-solving skills so critical to effective school-based management. Nor are they learning how to teach these skills to their students, even though the skills are increasingly important in the workplace. They are not being effectively taught how to work with at-risk students, nor how to form effective partnerships with parents.

Recommendations

a. We need to bring our teacher education programs in line with what we know today about teaching and learning. We want to teach for today's schools. The teacher education curriculum should include more instruction in effective math and science teaching methods, how to use instructional technology, how to be leaders in the restructuring of schools, how to work with at-risk students, and how to form effective partnerships with parents.

b. Our Colleges of Education should take the lead in educational reform in the public schools.

Recommendations

To keep us on track toward our Master Plan goals, the Board of Regents should initiate a comprehensive three-year collaborative effort to restructure our teacher education curricula so we will be ready when the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards implements its standards in 1993.

1. The Board of Regents should hire a national consultant, possibly from the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, to assist in designing a system for the Board of Regents to work jointly with the Department of Education and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) to conduct a comprehensive curriculum review for all teacher education programs over the next three years. Further, a national panel with representatives from NCATE and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards should evaluate the joint curriculum review process.

2. The Board of Regents staff in collaboration with the Department of Education should develop an implementation plan for the simultaneous curriculum review and reauthorization of all teacher education programs and limited access program authorizations.

3. Limited access proposals for teacher education programs should include a plan to direct teacher education enrollments to critical teacher shortage areas.

4. The 1989-90 Board of Regents Teacher Education Program Review should identify a specific component of coursework suitable for delivery at the community college level.

5. Each of our universities should set goals for minority enrollment in its College of Education.

6. Progress toward meeting the Master Plan goals for teacher education production should be measured by the following indicators:

   a. the total number of graduates completing approved programs for initial certification;

b. the total number of graduates completing approved programs for initial certification as a percentage of the estimated number of vacancies in Florida's public schools;

c. the number of graduates in the critical teacher shortage areas; and

d. the number of Black and Hispanic graduates completing approved programs for initial certification.

7. The university presidents need to become involved in the Master Plan goals. The university presidents should take a leadership role in implementing these goals. University resources should be directed toward successful achievement of the teacher education goals.

APPENDIX D

GLOSSARY

BOE	**Board of Examiners (NCATE)**
BOR	**Board of Regents**
BTP	**Beginning Teacher Program** A program designed to provide guidance, support, and practical skills to teachers at the outset of their careers; required for eligibility for a Florida Educator's Certificate.
CLAST	**College Level Academic Skills Test** Florida achievement test of computation and communication skills; required for students before they achieve upper-division status.
COE	**College of Education**
COEHS	**College of Education and Human Services**
DOE	**Department of Education**
EXCEL/SPRINT	**Excelling in Clinical Education Learning/ Supervisors of Pre-Intern Teachers** Collaboration among the COEHS at UNF, Clay, and Duval Public Schools to improve teacher preparation. Classroom teachers join the UNF faculty as Clinical Educators.
FEGC	**Florida Essential Generic Competencies** State-mandated competencies for students in Teacher Education Programs.
FPMS	**Florida Performance Measurement System** Domains of teaching behaviors that, along with the FEGC, provide the framework for professional studies in teacher education.
FTCE	**Florida Teacher Certification Examination** Assessment of proficiency in teaching specialization, professional knowledge, and academic skills; required for Florida licensure in teacher education.
IRDTE	**Institute for Research and Development in Teacher Education** Florida Atlantic University institute that serves to catalyze research and development efforts of faculty in teacher education, and serve as a clearinghouse, support, and outreach center.
NCATE	**National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education**
PCOTE	**President's Council on Teacher Education** University of North Florida council charged with addressing policy issues and institutional-wide matters as they relate to professional education.
PIET	**Partnership in Educational Technology** A collaboration among the COEHS at UNF, Duval Public Schools, and the Apple Computer Corporation designed to place a trained instructional technologist elementary teacher in each of Duval County's elementary schools.

PREMIER	**Preparation of Minority Educators** A collaboration among the COEHS at UNF, Duval Public Schools, and Florida Community College at Jacksonville to identify, recruit, and retain minority teacher candidates.
PROTEACH	**Professional Teacher** The University of Florida's integrated, five-year teacher preparation program in elementary, special, and secondary education, leading to initial certification and the master's degree.
SACS	**Southern Association of Colleges and Schools**
SASS	**Student Academic Support System** State-wide database in which students' academic progress records are maintained, and from which students are provided with updated audits of their progress toward degrees.
SCATT	**Suncoast Area Teacher Training** Preservice honors program at the University of South Florida.
SUS	**State University System**
TEAC	**Teacher Education Advisory Council** University of Central Florida advisory council, with representatives from the general education faculty.
TEAM	**The Florida Consortium on Teacher Education for America's Minorities** Regional consortium of seven Florida institutions, sponsored by the Ford Foundation.
TEC	**Teacher Education Center** Under the auspices of the Teacher Education Center Act of 1973, COEs provide professional development and consulting services to public schools throughout Florida.